arXiv:1603.01346v1 [math.QA] 4 Mar 2016

NEWTON-OKOUNKOV CONVEX BODIES OF SCHUBERT VARIETIES AND POLYHEDRAL REALIZATIONS OF CRYSTAL BASES

NAOKI FUJITA AND SATOSHI NAITO

Abstract. A Newton-Okounkov convex body is a convex body constructed from a projective variety with a valuation on its homogeneous coordinate ring; this is deeply connected with representation theory. For instance, the Littelmann string polytopes and the Feigin-Fourier-Littelmann-Vinberg polytopes are examples of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies. In this paper, we prove that the Newton-Okounkov convex body of a Schubert variety with respect to a specific valuation is identical to the Nakashima-Zelevinsky polyhedral realization of a Demazure crystal. As an application of this result, we show that Kashiwara's involution ($*$-operation) corresponds to a change of valuations on the rational function field.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Polyhedral realizations of crystal bases 3
2.1. Abstract crystals 3
2.2. Crystal bases and global bases 4
2.3. Polyhedral realizations of Demazure crystals 6
3. Newton-Okounkov convex bodies of Schubert varieties 9
3.1. Newton-Okounkov convex bodies 9
3.2. Highest term valuations 12
4. Main result 13
4.1. Statement of the main result 13
4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.1 13
5. Applications 16
5.1. Explicit forms of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies 16
5.2. Relation with Kashiwara's involution 18
References 21

1. Introduction

The study of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies is started by Okounkov in order to study multiplicity functions for representations of a reductive group ([O1], [O2]), and afterward developed independently by Kaveh-Khovanskii ([KK1]) and by Lazarsfeld-Mustata ([LM]). These convex bodies generalize Newton polytopes for toric varieties to arbitrary projective varieties, and have various kinds of information about corresponding projective varieties; for instance, we can systematically construct a series of toric degenerations (see [HK, Corollary 3.14] and [A, Theorem 1]). Hence it is important to describe the explicit form of a Newton-Okounkov convex body. As an application of our main result below, we obtain a series of examples, in which a Newton-Okounkov convex body is given by a system of explicit affine inequalities.

A remarkable fact is that the theory of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies of Schubert varieties and Bott-Samelson varieties is deeply connected with representation theory. For instance, Kaveh ([Kav]) proved that the Newton-Okounkov convex body of a Schubert variety with respect to a specific valuation is identical to the Littelmann string polytope constructed from the string parameterization for a Demazure crystal. Furthermore, one of the authors ([F]) extended this result of Kaveh to Bott-Samelson varieties. Also, the Feigin-Fourier-Littelmann-Vinberg polytopes are examples of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies (see [FFL] and [Kir]). The purpose of this paper is to realize the Newton-Okounkov

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 17B37; Secondary 05E10, 14M15, 14M25.
Key words and phrases. Newton-Okounkov bodies, Schubert varieties, Nakashima-Zelevinsky polyhedral realizations, Kashiwara's involution.

convex body of a Schubert variety with respect to a specific valuation as the Nakashima-Zelevinsky polyhedral realization of a Demazure crystal.

To be more precise, let G be a connected, simply-connected semisimple algebraic group over $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathfrak{g}$ its Lie algebra, W the Weyl group, and $E_i, F_i, h_i \in \mathfrak{g}$, $i \in I$, the Chevalley generators, where I denotes an index set for the vertices of the Dynkin diagram. Choose a Borel subgroup $B \subset G$, and denote by $X(w) \subset G/B$ the Schubert variety corresponding to $w \in W$. A dominant integral weight λ gives a line bundle $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ on G/B; by restricting this bundle, we obtain a line bundle on $X(w)$, which we denote by the same symbol $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$. From the Borel-Weil theorem, we know that the space $H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ of global sections is a B-module isomorphic to the dual module $V_w(\lambda)^*$; here, $V_w(\lambda)$ denotes the Demazure module corresponding to w. We take a valuation v on the function field $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ with values in $\mathbb{Z}^r$, where $r := \ell(w)$, the length of w, and fix a nonzero section $\tau \in H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$; in addition, we assume that v has one-dimensional leaves (see §§3.1 for the definition). From these data, we construct a semigroup $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau) \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r$ (see Definition 3.6). If we denote by $C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^r$ the smallest real closed cone containing $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$, then the Newton-Okounkov convex body $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau) \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ is defined to be the intersection of $C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ and $\{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^r$. Now we restrict ourselves to a specific valuation. Let us take a reduced word $\mathbf{i} = (i_r, \ldots, i_1)$ for w. By using the birational morphism

$$\mathbb{C}^r \to X(w),\ (t_r, \ldots, t_1) \mapsto \exp(t_r F_{i_r}) \exp(t_{r-1} F_{i_{r-1}}) \cdots \exp(t_1 F_{i_1}) \bmod B,$$

we identify the function field $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ with the rational function field $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \ldots, t_1)$. Define a valuation $v_{\mathbf{i}}$ on $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ to be the highest term valuation on $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \ldots, t_1)$ with respect to the lexicographic order $t_1 > \cdots > t_r$ (see Example 3.3). For a dominant integral weight λ, let $\tau_\lambda \in H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ denote the lowest weight vector; by restricting this section, we obtain a section in $H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$, which we denote by the same symbol τ_λ. In this setting, we study the Newton-Okounkov convex body $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$.

Let $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be the quantized enveloping algebra, and $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ the crystal basis of the negative part $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. Denote by $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ the crystal basis of the irreducible highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V_q(\lambda)$ with highest weight λ, and by $\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ the Demazure crystal corresponding to $w \in W$. In the theory of crystal bases, it is important to give their concrete realizations. Until now, many useful realizations have been discovered; the theory of Nakashima-Zelevinsky polyhedral realizations is one of them. Take an infinite sequence of indices $\tilde{\mathbf{i}} = (\ldots, i_k, \ldots, i_2, i_1)$ such that $i_k \neq i_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$, and such that the cardinality of $\{k \geq 1 \mid i_k = i\}$ is ∞ for each $i \in I$. Then, we can associate to $\tilde{\mathbf{i}}$ a crystal structure on $\mathbb{Z}^\infty := \{(\ldots, a_k, \ldots, a_2, a_1) \mid a_k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } a_k = 0 \text{ for } k \gg 0\}$, and obtain an embedding of crystals $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}} : \mathcal{B}(\infty) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\infty$, called the Kashiwara embedding with respect to $\tilde{\mathbf{i}}$ (see §§2.3). Nakashima-Zelevinsky ([NZ]) described explicitly the image of $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ under a certain positivity assumption on $\tilde{\mathbf{i}}$. Afterward, Nakashima ([N1], [N2]) gave a similar description of the Demazure crystal $\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$ under the assumption that $(\tilde{\mathbf{i}}, \lambda)$ is ample (see Definition 5.1). These descriptions of crystal bases are called polyhedral realizations. Let $\mathbf{i} = (i_r, \ldots, i_1)$ be a reduced word for $w \in W$, and extend it to a reduced word $\hat{\mathbf{i}} = (i_N, \ldots, i_{r+1}, i_r, \ldots, i_1)$ for the longest element $w_0 \in W$. We consider the Kashiwara embedding $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}$ with respect to an extension $\tilde{\mathbf{i}} = (\ldots, i_k, \ldots, i_{N+1}, i_N, \ldots, i_2, i_1)$ of $\hat{\mathbf{i}}$. In this case, the image of $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ (resp., $\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$) can be regarded as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^N$ (resp., $\mathbb{Z}^r$) (see Remark 2.12 and Definition 2.14); we denote by $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}} : \mathcal{B}(\infty) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^N$ and $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} : \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ the corresponding embeddings. From the embedding $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$, we obtain a subset $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r$ (see Definition 2.15). Let us denote by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^r$ the smallest real closed cone containing $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$, and by $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ the intersection of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ and $\{1\} \times \mathbb{R}^r$. By using the theory of generalized string polytopes (see [F] for the definition), we deduce that $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \cap \mathbb{Z}^r = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda))$ (see Corollary 2.20); here, we do not necessarily assume that $(\tilde{\mathbf{i}}, \lambda)$ is ample.

In order to relate the Newton-Okounkov convex body $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$ with the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$, we make use of global crystal bases. Let us denote by $\{G_\lambda^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)\} \subset V_w(\lambda)$ the specialization of the lower global basis at $q = 1$, and by $\{G_{\lambda,w}^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)\} \subset H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda) = V_w(\lambda)^*$ the dual basis (see §§4.1). The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem. *Let $\mathbf{i}$ be a reduced word for $w \in W$, and λ a dominant integral weight.*

(1) *The Kashiwara embedding $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}(b)$ is equal to $-v_{\mathbf{i}}(G_{\lambda,w}^{\mathrm{up}}(b)/\tau_\lambda)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$.*

(2) *The polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is identical to $-\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$.*

§§5.1 is devoted to the study of explicit forms of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies. To be more precise, under the assumption that $(\tilde{\mathbf{i}}, \lambda)$ is ample, Nakashima's description of $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda))$ also gives a system of explicit affine inequalities defining the Newton-Okounkov convex body $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = -\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$.

In §§5.2, we compare our result with the result of [Kav]. To be more precise, let us define a valuation $\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}$ on $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ to be the highest term valuation on $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \dots, t_1)$ with respect to the lexicographic order $t_r \succ \cdots \succ t_1$ (see Example 3.3). Kaveh ([Kav]) proved that the value $-\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}(G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda,w}(b)/\tau_\lambda)$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$ is equal to the string parameterization of b with respect to $\mathbf{i}$, and that the Newton-Okounkov convex body $-\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, \tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$ is identical to the Littelmann string polytope $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$. Let us consider the case that $w = w_0$. In this case, the Schubert variety $X(w_0)$ is just the full flag variety G/B, and the Demazure crystal $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}(\lambda)$ is just the crystal basis $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$. We denote the section $G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda,w_0}(b) \in H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ simply by $G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b)$. For a reduced word $\mathbf{i} = (i_N, \dots, i_1)$ for w_0, our result combined with the result of Kaveh above implies that Kashiwara's involution $* : \mathcal{B}(\infty) \to \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ corresponds to the change of valuations from $v_{\mathbf{i}}$ to $\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}$, which gives a geometric interpretation of $*$; here we write $\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}} := (i_1, \dots, i_N)$. More precisely, we obtain the following.

Corollary. *Let $\mathbf{i}$ be a reduced word for w_0, and $N := \ell(w_0)$. Then, there exists a piecewise-linear map $\eta_{\mathbf{i}} : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfying the following conditions*:

(i) *The map $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}$ corresponds to Kashiwara's involution $*$ through the Kashiwara embedding $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}$:*
$$b^* = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{-1} \circ \eta_{\mathbf{i}} \circ \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)$$
for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.

(ii) *The map $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}$ corresponds to the change of valuations from $v_{\mathbf{i}}$ to $\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}$:*
$$\eta_{\mathbf{i}}(-v_{\mathbf{i}}(G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b)/\tau_\lambda)) = -\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}(G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(b)/\tau_\lambda)$$
for every dominant integral weight λ and $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$.

(iii) *The map $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}$ induces a bijective piecewise-linear map from the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w_0)} = -\Delta(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$ onto the string polytope $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}^{(\lambda,w_0)} = -\Delta(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda, \tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}, \tau_\lambda)$ for every dominant integral weight λ.*

2. Polyhedral realizations of crystal bases

2.1. **Abstract crystals.** First of all, we recall the definition of abstract crystals introduced in [Kas4]. Let G be a connected, simply-connected semisimple algebraic group over $\mathbb{C}$ of rank n, $\mathfrak{g}$ its Lie algebra, and W the Weyl group. Choose a Borel subgroup $B \subset G$ and a maximal torus $T \subset B$. Denote by $\mathfrak{t}$ the Lie algebra of T, by $\mathfrak{t}^* := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathbb{C})$ its dual space, and by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathfrak{t}^* \times \mathfrak{t} \to \mathbb{C}$ the canonical pairing. Let $\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\} \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$ be the set of simple roots, $\{h_i \mid i \in I\} \subset \mathfrak{t}$ the set of simple coroots, and $P \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$ the weight lattice, where $I := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, an index set for the vertices of the Dynkin diagram.

Definition 2.1. A *crystal* $\mathcal{B}$ is a set equipped with the maps
$$\mathrm{wt} : \mathcal{B} \to P,$$
$$\varepsilon_i : \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\},\ \varphi_i : \mathcal{B} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\} \text{ for } i \in I, \text{ and}$$
$$\tilde{e}_i : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B} \cup \{0\},\ \tilde{f}_i : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B} \cup \{0\} \text{ for } i \in I,$$
satisfying the following conditions:

(i) $\varphi_i(b) = \varepsilon_i(b) + \langle \mathrm{wt}(b), h_i \rangle$ for $i \in I$,

(ii) $\mathrm{wt}(\tilde{e}_i b) = \mathrm{wt}(b) + \alpha_i$, $\varepsilon_i(\tilde{e}_i b) = \varepsilon_i(b) - 1$, and $\varphi_i(\tilde{e}_i b) = \varphi_i(b) + 1$ for $i \in I$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\tilde{e}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$,

(iii) $\mathrm{wt}(\tilde{f}_i b) = \mathrm{wt}(b) - \alpha_i$, $\varepsilon_i(\tilde{f}_i b) = \varepsilon_i(b) + 1$, and $\varphi_i(\tilde{f}_i b) = \varphi_i(b) - 1$ for $i \in I$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\tilde{f}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$,

(iv) $b' = \tilde{e}_i b$ if and only if $b = \tilde{f}_i b'$ for $i \in I$ and $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$,

(v) $\tilde{e}_i b = \tilde{f}_i b = 0$ for $i \in I$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\varphi_i(b) = -\infty$.

Here, $-\infty$ and 0 are additional elements that are not contained in $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, respectively.

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ be two crystals. A map
$$\psi : \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \{0\} \to \mathcal{B}_2 \cup \{0\}$$
is called a *strict morphism* of crystals from $\mathcal{B}_1$ to $\mathcal{B}_2$ if it satisfies the following conditions:

(i) $\psi(0) = 0$,

(ii) $\mathrm{wt}(\psi(b)) = \mathrm{wt}(b)$, $\varepsilon_i(\psi(b)) = \varepsilon_i(b)$, and $\varphi_i(\psi(b)) = \varphi_i(b)$ for $i \in I$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}_1$ such that $\psi(b) \in \mathcal{B}_2$,

(iii) $\tilde{e}_i\psi(b) = \psi(\tilde{e}_i b)$ and $\tilde{f}_i\psi(b) = \psi(\tilde{f}_i b)$ for $i \in I$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}_1$;

here, if $\psi(b) = 0$, then we set $\tilde{e}_i\psi(b) = \tilde{f}_i\psi(b) = 0$. An injective strict morphism is called a *strict embedding* of crystals.

Consider the total order $<$ on $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ given by the usual order on $\mathbb{Z}$, and by $-\infty < s$ for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. For two crystals $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$, we can define another crystal $\mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$ (called the tensor product) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2 := \{b_1 \otimes b_2 \mid b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1,\ b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2\},\\
&\mathrm{wt}(b_1 \otimes b_2) := \mathrm{wt}(b_1) + \mathrm{wt}(b_2),\\
&\varepsilon_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) := \max\{\varepsilon_i(b_1),\ \varepsilon_i(b_2) - \langle \mathrm{wt}(b_1), h_i\rangle\},\\
&\varphi_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) := \max\{\varphi_i(b_2),\ \varphi_i(b_1) + \langle \mathrm{wt}(b_2), h_i\rangle\},\\
&\tilde{e}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) := \begin{cases} \tilde{e}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) \geq \varepsilon_i(b_2),\\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{e}_i b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) < \varepsilon_i(b_2),\end{cases}\\
&\tilde{f}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) := \begin{cases} \tilde{f}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) > \varepsilon_i(b_2),\\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{f}_i b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) \leq \varepsilon_i(b_2).\end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $b_1 \otimes b_2$ stands for an ordered pair (b_1, b_2), and we set $b_1 \otimes 0 = 0 \otimes b_2 = 0$.

Example 2.3. For $\lambda \in P$, let $R_\lambda = \{r_\lambda\}$ be the crystal consisting of only one element given by: $\mathrm{wt}(r_\lambda) = \lambda$, $\varepsilon_i(r_\lambda) = -\langle \lambda, h_i\rangle$, $\varphi_i(r_\lambda) = 0$, and $\tilde{e}_i r_\lambda = \tilde{f}_i r_\lambda = 0$.

2.2. **Crystal bases and global bases.** Here we recall some basic facts about crystal bases and global bases (following [Kas2], [Kas3], and [Kas4]). Define a symmetric bilinear form $(\cdot,\cdot)$ on $\mathfrak{t}^*$ by $2(\alpha_j, \alpha_i)/(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = \langle \alpha_j, h_i\rangle$ for all $i, j \in I$, and by $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = 2$ for all short simple roots α_i. We set $(c_{i,j})_{i,j\in I} := (\langle \alpha_j, h_i\rangle)_{i,j\in I}$, the Cartan matrix of $\mathfrak{g}$, and also set

$$\begin{aligned}
&q_i := q^{(\alpha_i,\alpha_i)/2} \text{ for } i \in I,\\
&[s]_i := \frac{q_i^s - q_i^{-s}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \text{ for } i \in I,\ s \in \mathbb{Z},\\
&[s]_i! := [s]_i[s-1]_i \cdots [1]_i \text{ for } i \in I,\ s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0},\\
&\begin{bmatrix} s \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i := \frac{[s]_i[s-1]_i \cdots [s-k+1]_i}{[k]_i[k-1]_i \cdots [1]_i} \text{ for } i \in I,\ s, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \text{ such that } k \leq s,
\end{aligned}$$

where $[0]_i! := 1$ and $\begin{bmatrix} s \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}_i := 1$.

Definition 2.4. For a finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, the *quantized enveloping algebra* $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is the unital associative $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-algebra with generators e_i, f_i, t_i, t_i^{-1}, $i \in I$, and relations:

(i) $t_i t_i^{-1} = 1$ and $t_i t_j = t_j t_i$ for $i, j \in I$,

(ii) $t_i e_j t_i^{-1} = q_i^{c_{i,j}} e_j$ and $t_i f_j t_i^{-1} = q_i^{-c_{i,j}} f_j$ for $i, j \in I$,

(iii) $e_i f_j - f_j e_i = \delta_{i,j}(t_i - t_i^{-1})/(q_i - q_i^{-1})$ for $i, j \in I$,

(iv) $\sum_{s=0}^{1-c_{i,j}} (-1)^s e_i^{(s)} e_j e_i^{(1-c_{i,j}-s)} = \sum_{s=0}^{1-c_{i,j}} (-1)^s f_i^{(s)} f_j f_i^{(1-c_{i,j}-s)} = 0$ for $i, j \in I$ such that $i \neq j$.

Here, $\delta_{i,j}$ denotes the Kronecker delta, and $e_i^{(s)} := e_i^s/[s]_i!$, $f_i^{(s)} := f_i^s/[s]_i!$ for $i \in I$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Let us denote by $U_q(\mathfrak{u})$ (resp., $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$) the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by $\{e_i \mid i \in I\}$ (resp., $\{f_i \mid i \in I\}$). Define a $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra involution $^-$ and a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-algebra anti-involution $*$ on $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{e}_i = e_i,\ \overline{f}_i = f_i,\ \overline{t_i} = t_i^{-1},\ \overline{q} = q^{-1}, \text{ and}\\
&e_i^* = e_i,\ f_i^* = f_i,\ t_i^* = t_i^{-1};
\end{aligned}$$

the involution $^-$ (resp., $*$) is called the *bar involution* (resp., *Kashiwara's involution*). Note that these preserve $U_q(\mathfrak{u})$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$; also, we have $* \circ {}^- = {}^- \circ *$. Denote by $A \subset \mathbb{Q}(q)$ the $\mathbb{Q}$-subalgebra of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ consisting of rational functions regular at $q = 0$. Let us take a free A-submodule $L(\infty) \subset U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$, a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis $\mathcal{B}(\infty) \subset L(\infty)/qL(\infty)$, and define operators $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i$, $i \in I$, on $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ as in [Kas2, §§3.5] (note that we use the notation $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ instead of $B(\infty)$). The operators $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i$, $i \in I$, are called the *Kashiwara operators*.

Proposition 2.5 (see [Kas2, Theorem 4]). *The following hold.*

(1) $\tilde{e}_i L(\infty) \subset L(\infty)$ *and* $\tilde{f}_i L(\infty) \subset L(\infty)$ *for all* $i \in I$; *hence* $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i$, $i \in I$, *act on* $L(\infty)/qL(\infty)$.
(2) $\tilde{e}_i \mathcal{B}(\infty) \subset \mathcal{B}(\infty) \cup \{0\}$ *and* $\tilde{f}_i \mathcal{B}(\infty) \subset \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ *for all* $i \in I$.
(3) *Define maps* $\varepsilon_i, \varphi_i : \mathcal{B}(\infty) \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ *for* $i \in I$ *by*

$$\varepsilon_i(b) := \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \tilde{e}_i^k b \neq 0\}, \text{ and } \varphi_i(b) := \varepsilon_i(b) + \langle \mathrm{wt}(b), h_i \rangle.$$

Then, the maps wt, ε_i, φ_i, $\tilde{e}_i$, *and* $\tilde{f}_i$, $i \in I$, *provide a crystal structure on* $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$.

The pair $(L(\infty), \mathcal{B}(\infty))$ is called the *lower crystal basis* of $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. We see from [Kas2, Proposition 5.2.4] that $L(\infty)^* = L(\infty)$, and from [Kas4, Theorem 2.1.1] that $\mathcal{B}(\infty)^* = \mathcal{B}(\infty)$. Hence the maps

$$\mathrm{wt},\ \varepsilon_i^* := \varepsilon_i \circ *,\ \varphi_i^* := \varphi_i \circ *,\ \tilde{e}_i^* := * \circ \tilde{e}_i \circ *, \text{ and } \tilde{f}_i^* := * \circ \tilde{f}_i \circ *,\ i \in I,$$

provide another crystal structure on $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$. For a dominant integral weight λ, let $V_q(\lambda)$ denote the irreducible highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module with highest weight λ over $\mathbb{Q}(q)$, and $v_{q,\lambda} \in V_q(\lambda)$ the highest weight vector. We take a free A-submodule $L(\lambda) \subset V_q(\lambda)$, a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis $\mathcal{B}(\lambda) \subset L(\lambda)/qL(\lambda)$, and operators $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i$, $i \in I$, on $V_q(\lambda)$ as in [Kas2, Section 2] (note that we use the notation $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ instead of $B(\lambda)$); the operators $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i$, $i \in I$, are also called the *Kashiwara operators*.

Proposition 2.6 (see [Kas2, Theorem 2]). *For a dominant integral weight* λ, *the following hold.*

(1) $\tilde{e}_i L(\lambda) \subset L(\lambda)$ *and* $\tilde{f}_i L(\lambda) \subset L(\lambda)$ *for all* $i \in I$; *hence* $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i$, $i \in I$, *act on* $L(\lambda)/qL(\lambda)$.
(2) $\tilde{e}_i \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \cup \{0\}$ *and* $\tilde{f}_i \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \cup \{0\}$ *for all* $i \in I$.
(3) *Define maps* $\varepsilon_i, \varphi_i : \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ *for* $i \in I$ *by*

$$\varepsilon_i(b) := \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \tilde{e}_i^k b \neq 0\}, \text{ and } \varphi_i(b) := \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \tilde{f}_i^k b \neq 0\}.$$

Then, the maps wt, ε_i, φ_i, $\tilde{e}_i$, *and* $\tilde{f}_i$, $i \in I$, *provide a crystal structure on* $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$.

The pair $(L(\lambda), \mathcal{B}(\lambda))$ is called the *lower crystal basis* of $V_q(\lambda)$. The crystals $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ are related as follows.

Proposition 2.7 ([Kas2, Theorem 5]). *For a dominant integral weight* λ, *let* $\pi_\lambda : U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-) \twoheadrightarrow V_q(\lambda)$ *denote the surjective* $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$*-module homomorphism given by* $u \mapsto u \cdot v_{q,\lambda}$.

(1) *The equality* $\pi_\lambda(L(\infty)) = L(\lambda)$ *holds*; *hence* π_λ *induces a surjective* $\mathbb{Q}$*-linear map* $L(\infty)/qL(\infty) \twoheadrightarrow L(\lambda)/qL(\lambda)$ (*denoted also by* π_λ).
(2) *The* $\mathbb{Q}$*-linear map* π_λ *induces a bijective map* $\pi_\lambda : \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$, *where*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda) := \{b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty) \mid \pi_\lambda(b) \neq 0\}.$$

(3) $\tilde{f}_i \pi_\lambda(b) = \pi_\lambda(\tilde{f}_i b)$ *for all* $i \in I$, $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.
(4) $\tilde{e}_i \pi_\lambda(b) = \pi_\lambda(\tilde{e}_i b)$ *for all* $i \in I$, $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$.

It follows easily from Proposition 2.7 (3), (4) that $\varepsilon_i(\pi_\lambda(b)) = \varepsilon_i(b)$, and that $\varphi_i(\pi_\lambda(b)) = \varphi_i(b) + \langle \lambda, h_i \rangle$ for all $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$.

Now we denote by $U_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ the $\mathbb{Q}[q, q^{-1}]$-subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ generated by $\{f_i^{(k)} \mid i \in I,\ k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$, and set $V_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) := \pi_\lambda(U_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{u}^-))$; note that the $U_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{u}^-)$-submodule $V_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)$ is invariant under the action of e_i, f_i, and $(t_i - t_i^{-1})/(q_i - q_i^{-1})$ for all $i \in I$. Also, we define a $\mathbb{Q}$-involution $^-$ on $V_q(\lambda)$ by $\overline{u \cdot v_{q,\lambda}} := \overline{u} \cdot v_{q,\lambda}$ for $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Then, the natural maps

$$L(\infty) \cap \overline{L(\infty)} \cap U_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{u}^-) \to L(\infty)/qL(\infty) \text{ and}$$
$$L(\lambda) \cap \overline{L(\lambda)} \cap V_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) \to L(\lambda)/qL(\lambda)$$

are isomorphisms of $\mathbb{Q}$-vector spaces ([Kas2, Theorem 6]). If we denote by $G_q^{\mathrm{low}} : L(\infty)/qL(\infty) \to L(\infty) \cap \overline{L(\infty)} \cap U_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ and $G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}} : L(\lambda)/qL(\lambda) \to L(\lambda) \cap \overline{L(\lambda)} \cap V_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)$ the inverses of these isomorphisms, respectively, then the set $\{G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)\}$ (resp., $\{G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)\}$) forms a $\mathbb{Q}[q, q^{-1}]$-basis of $U_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ (resp., $V_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)$); this is called the *lower global basis* of $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ (resp., the *lower global basis* of $V_q(\lambda)$). The following is a fundamental property of these bases.

Proposition 2.8. *For a dominant integral weight* λ, *the following hold.*

(1) $G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b)^* = G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b^*)$ *for all* $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.
(2) $\pi_\lambda(G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b)) = G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(\pi_\lambda(b))$ *for all* $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.

(3) *For all* $i \in I$, $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$, *and* $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$,

$$e_i^{(k)} \cdot G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \in \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_i(b)+k \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(\tilde{e}_i^k b) + \sum_{\substack{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda);\ \mathrm{wt}(b')=\mathrm{wt}(\tilde{e}_i^k b), \\ \varphi_i(b') > \varphi_i(\tilde{e}_i^k b)}} \mathbb{Z}[q,q^{-1}] G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(b'), \text{ and}$$

$$f_i^{(k)} \cdot G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \in \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_i(b)+k \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(\tilde{f}_i^k b) + \sum_{\substack{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda);\ \mathrm{wt}(b')=\mathrm{wt}(\tilde{f}_i^k b), \\ \varepsilon_i(b') > \varepsilon_i(\tilde{f}_i^k b)}} \mathbb{Z}[q,q^{-1}] G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(b').$$

(4) *For all* $i \in I$, $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, *and* $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$,

$$f_i^{(k)} \cdot G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \in \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_i(b)+k \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(\tilde{f}_i^k b) + \sum_{\substack{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty);\ \mathrm{wt}(b')=\mathrm{wt}(\tilde{f}_i^k b), \\ \varepsilon_i(b') > \varepsilon_i(\tilde{f}_i^k b)}} \mathbb{Z}[q,q^{-1}] G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b'), \text{ and}$$

$$G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \cdot f_i^{(k)} \in \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_i^*(b)+k \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i G_q^{\mathrm{low}}((\tilde{f}_i^*)^k b) + \sum_{\substack{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty);\ \mathrm{wt}(b')=\mathrm{wt}((\tilde{f}_i^*)^k b), \\ \varepsilon_i^*(b') > \varepsilon_i^*((\tilde{f}_i^*)^k b)}} \mathbb{Z}[q,q^{-1}] G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b').$$

Proof. It follows from the equality $* \circ {}^- = {}^- \circ *$ that $\overline{L(\infty)}$ and hence $L(\infty) \cap \overline{L(\infty)} \cap U_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ are invariant under Kashiwara's involution $*$, which implies part (1). Part (2) (resp., part (3)) is an immediate consequence of [Kas2, Lemma 7.3.2] (resp., [Kas4, equation (3.1.2)]). Now we deduce the first assertion of part (4) from part (2) and part (3) (here we take a dominant integral weight λ such that $\langle \lambda, h_i \rangle$, $i \in I$, are sufficiently large for each $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$). Finally, the second assertion of part (4) follows from the first assertion of part (4) and from the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} (G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \cdot f_i^{(k)})^* &= (f_i^{(k)})^* \cdot G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b)^* \quad (\text{since } * \text{ is a } \mathbb{Q}(q)\text{-algebra anti-involution}) \\ &= f_i^{(k)} \cdot G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b^*) \quad (\text{by part (1)}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 2.9. For $w \in W$ and a dominant integral weight λ, let $v_{q,w\lambda} \in V_q(\lambda)$ denote the (extremal) weight vector of weight $w\lambda$. Then, the $U_q(\mathfrak{u})$-submodule $V_{q,w}(\lambda) := U_q(\mathfrak{u}) \cdot v_{q,w\lambda} \subset V_q(\lambda)$ is called the *Demazure module* corresponding to w.

Denote by $b_\infty \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ the element corresponding to $1 \in U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$, and by $b_\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ the highest weight element.

Proposition 2.10 (see [Kas4, Propositions 3.2.3, 3.2.5])**.** *Let* $\mathbf{i} = (i_r, \ldots, i_1)$ *be a reduced word for* $w \in W$ (*notice the ordering of indices*), *and* λ *a dominant integral weight.*

(1) *The subset*

$$\mathcal{B}_w(\infty) := \{\tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} b_\infty \mid a_1, \ldots, a_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\} \subset \mathcal{B}(\infty)$$

is independent of the choice of a reduced word $\mathbf{i}$, *and* $\tilde{e}_i \mathcal{B}_w(\infty) \subset \mathcal{B}_w(\infty) \cup \{0\}$ *for all* $i \in I$.

(2) *The subset*

$$\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda) := \{\tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} b_\lambda \mid a_1, \ldots, a_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\} \setminus \{0\} \subset \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$$

is independent of the choice of a reduced word $\mathbf{i}$, *and* $\tilde{e}_i \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda) \cup \{0\}$ *for all* $i \in I$.

(3) *The equality* $\pi_\lambda(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty)) = \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda) \cup \{0\}$ *holds*; *hence* π_λ *induces a bijective map* $\pi_\lambda : \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_w(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$, *where* $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_w(\lambda) := \mathcal{B}_w(\infty) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$.

(4) *The set* $\{G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)\}$ *forms a* $\mathbb{Q}(q)$*-basis of* $V_{q,w}(\lambda)$.

The subsets $\mathcal{B}_w(\infty), \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$ are called *Demazure crystals*.

2.3. **Polyhedral realizations of Demazure crystals.** In this subsection, we recall some fundamental properties of Nakashima-Zelevinsky polyhedral realizations of crystal bases (following [NZ], [N1], and [N2]). Fix a reduced word $\mathbf{i} = (i_N, \ldots, i_1)$ for the longest element $w_0 \in W$, and consider an extension $\tilde{\mathbf{i}} = (\ldots, i_k, \ldots, i_{N+1}, i_N, \ldots, i_1)$ of $\mathbf{i}$ such that $i_k \neq i_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$, and such that the cardinality of $\{k \geq 1 \mid i_k = i\}$ is ∞ for each $i \in I$. Following [Kas4] and [NZ], we associate to $\tilde{\mathbf{i}}$ a crystal structure

on $\mathbb{Z}^\infty := \{(\dots, a_k, \dots, a_2, a_1) \mid a_k \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } a_k = 0 \text{ for } k \gg 0\}$ as follows. For $k \geq 1$, $i \in I$, and $\mathbf{a} = (\dots, a_j, \dots, a_2, a_1) \in \mathbb{Z}^\infty$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_k(\mathbf{a}) &:= a_k + \sum_{j>k} \langle \alpha_{i_j}, h_{i_k} \rangle a_j \in \mathbb{Z},\\ \sigma^{(i)}(\mathbf{a}) &:= \max\{\sigma_k(\mathbf{a}) \mid k \geq 1,\ i_k = i\} \in \mathbb{Z}, \text{ and}\\ M^{(i)}(\mathbf{a}) &:= \{k \geq 1 \mid i_k = i,\ \sigma_k(\mathbf{a}) = \sigma^{(i)}(\mathbf{a})\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $a_j = 0$ for $j \gg 0$, the integers $\sigma_k(\mathbf{a}), \sigma^{(i)}(\mathbf{a})$ are well-defined; also, we have $\sigma^{(i)}(\mathbf{a}) \geq 0$. Moreover, $M^{(i)}(\mathbf{a})$ is a finite set if and only if $\sigma^{(i)}(\mathbf{a}) > 0$. Define a crystal structure on $\mathbb{Z}^\infty$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{wt}(\mathbf{a}) &:= -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \alpha_{i_j},\ \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{a}) := \sigma^{(i)}(\mathbf{a}),\ \varphi_i(\mathbf{a}) := \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{a}) + \langle \mathrm{wt}(\mathbf{a}), h_i \rangle, \text{ and}\\ \tilde{e}_i\mathbf{a} &:= \begin{cases} (a_k - \delta_{k,\max M^{(i)}(\mathbf{a})})_{k\geq 1} & \text{if } \sigma^{(i)}(\mathbf{a}) > 0,\\ 0 & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}\\ \tilde{f}_i\mathbf{a} &:= (a_k + \delta_{k,\min M^{(i)}(\mathbf{a})})_{k\geq 1}\end{aligned}$$

for $i \in I$ and $\mathbf{a} = (\dots, a_k, \dots, a_2, a_1) \in \mathbb{Z}^\infty$; we denote this crystal by $\mathbb{Z}^\infty_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}$.

Proposition 2.11 (see [NZ, §§2.4])**.** *The following hold.*

1. *There exists a unique strict embedding of crystals $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}} : \mathcal{B}(\infty) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\infty_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}$ such that $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(b_\infty) = (\dots, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$.*
2. *For $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, write $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(b) = (\dots, a_k, \dots, a_2, a_1)$. Then,*

$$b^* = \tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \tilde{f}_{i_2}^{a_2} \cdots b_\infty, \text{ and } \tilde{e}_{i_{k-1}} \tilde{f}_{i_k}^{a_k} \tilde{f}_{i_{k+1}}^{a_{k+1}} \cdots b_\infty = 0 \text{ for all } k > 1;$$

namely, the sequence $(a_k)_{k\geq 1}$ is identical to the string parameterization of b^* with respect to the sequence $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k, \dots)$.

The embedding $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}$ (resp., the image $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$) is called the *Kashiwara embedding* (resp., the *Nakashima-Zelevinsky polyhedral realization* of $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$) with respect to $\tilde{\mathbf{i}}$.

Remark 2.12. By [Kas4, Proposition 3.2.5 (ii)], it follows that $\tilde{f}_i \mathcal{B}_{w_0}(\infty) \subset \mathcal{B}_{w_0}(\infty)$ for all $i \in I$, and hence that $\mathcal{B}_{w_0}(\infty) = \mathcal{B}(\infty)$. Since $\mathbf{i} = (i_N, \dots, i_1)$ is a reduced word for w_0, we deduce that $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty)) \subset \{(\dots, a_k, \dots, a_2, a_1) \in \mathbb{Z}^\infty_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}} \mid a_k = 0 \text{ for all } k > N\}$; hence the image $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$ can be regarded as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^N$ by

$$\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^N,\ (\dots, 0, 0, a_N, \dots, a_2, a_1) \mapsto (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N);$$

note that the ordering of entries is reversed. Since the composite map $\mathcal{B}(\infty) \xrightarrow{\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}} \Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^N$ is independent of the choice of an extension $\tilde{\mathbf{i}}$ by Proposition 2.11 (2), we denote this map simply by $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}$; this is also called the *Kashiwara embedding* with respect to $\mathbf{i}$. Here we should mention that Nakashima-Zelevinsky ([NZ]) called an explicit description $\Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}$ of $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$ a polyhedral realization (see [NZ, Theorem 3.1]); our terminology is slightly different from the original one.

Let us write $\mathbb{Z}^\infty_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda] := \mathbb{Z}^\infty_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}} \otimes R_\lambda$, and identify $\mathbb{Z}^\infty_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda]$ with $\mathbb{Z}^\infty_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}$ as a set; note that their crystal structures are different. By [N1, Theorem 3.1], there exists a unique strict embedding of crystals

$$\Omega_\lambda : \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\infty) \otimes R_\lambda$$

such that $\Omega_\lambda(b_\lambda) = b_\infty \otimes r_\lambda$. Remark that $\Omega_\lambda(\mathcal{B}(\lambda)) = \{b \otimes r_\lambda \mid b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)\}$, and that $\Omega_\lambda(\pi_\lambda(b)) = b \otimes r_\lambda$ for all $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$, where $\pi_\lambda : \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ denotes the bijective map given in Proposition 2.7 (2). Next we consider an arbitrary element $w \in W$. Let $\mathbf{i} = (i_r, \dots, i_1)$ be a reduced word for w, and extend it to a reduced word $\hat{\mathbf{i}} = (i_N, \dots, i_{r+1}, i_r, \dots, i_1)$ for w_0. In addition, we take an extension $\tilde{\mathbf{i}} = (\dots, i_k, \dots, i_{N+1}, i_N, \dots, i_1)$ of $\hat{\mathbf{i}}$ as above.

Proposition 2.13 ([N1, Theorem 3.2] and [N2, Propositions 3.1, 3.3 (i)])**.** *For a dominant integral weight λ, the following hold.*

(1) *There exists a unique strict embedding of crystals*

$$\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)} : \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \xhookrightarrow{\Omega_\lambda} \mathcal{B}(\infty) \otimes R_\lambda \xhookrightarrow{\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}} \otimes \mathrm{id}} \mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{\infty} \otimes R_\lambda = \mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{\infty}[\lambda]$$

such that $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(b_\lambda) = (\dots, 0, \dots, 0, 0) \otimes r_\lambda$.

(2) *There hold the equalities*

$$\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty)) = \{(\dots, a_k, \dots, a_2, a_1) \in \Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty)) \mid a_k = 0 \text{ for all } k > r\},$$
$$\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)) = \{(\dots, a_k, \dots, a_2, a_1) \otimes r_\lambda \in \Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{B}(\lambda)) \mid a_k = 0 \text{ for all } k > r\}.$$

We call $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda))$ the *polyhedral realization* of $\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$ with respect to $\tilde{\mathbf{i}}$.

Definition 2.14. The sets $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty))$ and $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda))$ can be regarded as subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^r$ by

$$\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r,\ (\dots, 0, 0, a_r, \dots, a_2, a_1) \mapsto (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r), \text{ and}$$
$$\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r,\ (\dots, 0, 0, a_r, \dots, a_2, a_1) \otimes r_\lambda \mapsto (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r).$$

Since the composite maps $\mathcal{B}_w(\infty) \xrightarrow{\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}} \Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ and $\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}} \Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ are independent of the choices of $\hat{\mathbf{i}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{i}}$, we denote these maps simply by $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(w)}$ and $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$, respectively; these are also called the *Kashiwara embeddings* with respect to $\mathbf{i}$.

Definition 2.15. Define a subset $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r$ by

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} := \bigcup_{k>0} \{(k, \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(k\lambda,w)}(b)) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_w(k\lambda)\},$$

and denote by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^r$ the smallest real closed cone containing $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$, that is,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} := \overline{\{c \cdot (k, \mathbf{a}) \mid c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \text{ and } (k, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}\}},$$

where $\overline{H}$ means the closure of $H \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^r$ with respect to the Euclidean topology. Now let us define a subset $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ by

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^r \mid (1, \mathbf{a}) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}\}.$$

The set $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is also called the *polyhedral realization* of $\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$ with respect to $\mathbf{i}$.

We will prove that the set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is identical to the set of all integral points in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \setminus \{0\}$, and that the polyhedral realization $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda))$ of $\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$ is identical to the set of all integral points in $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.16 (see [N1, Theorem 3.1])**.** *For the subset* $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$ *of* $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ *defined in Proposition 2.7 (2), there holds the equality*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda) = \{b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty) \mid \varepsilon_i^*(b) \leq \langle \lambda, h_i \rangle \text{ for all } i \in I\}.$$

For $\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}} := (i_1, \dots, i_r)$, which is a reduced word for w^{-1}, let $\Phi_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}} : \mathcal{B}_{w^{-1}}(\infty) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ denote the corresponding string parameterization; namely, if we write $\Phi_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}(b) = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}_{w^{-1}}(\infty)$, then we have

$$b = \tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \tilde{f}_{i_2}^{a_2} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} b_\infty, \text{ and } \tilde{e}_{i_{k-1}} \tilde{f}_{i_k}^{a_k} \tilde{f}_{i_{k+1}}^{a_{k+1}} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} b_\infty = 0 \text{ for } 1 < k \leq r.$$

It follows from Proposition 2.11 (2) that $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(w)} = \Phi_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}} \circ *$ on $\mathcal{B}_w(\infty)$; here we note that $\mathcal{B}_w(\infty)^* = \mathcal{B}_{w^{-1}}(\infty)$ by [Kas4, Proposition 3.3.1]. Therefore, if we denote by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}} \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ the smallest real closed cone containing $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty))$, then $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}$ is identical to the *string cone* associated to $\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}$ (see [BZ, §§3.2]), and the equality $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty)) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathbb{Z}^r$ holds (see [Lit, Section 1] and [BZ, Proposition 3.5]). Note that a system of explicit linear inequalities defining $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}$ is given in [BZ, Theorem 3.10]. In particular, the real closed cone $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}$ is a rational convex polyhedral cone, that is, there exists a finite number of rational points $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l \in \mathbb{Q}^r$ such that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mathbf{a}_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mathbf{a}_l$. Now for $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty))$, Proposition 2.7 (3) implies that $\pi_\lambda(\tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} b_\infty) = \tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} b_\lambda$. Therefore, if we take a dominant integral weight λ such that $\tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} b_\lambda \neq 0$, then we deduce from the remark following Proposition 2.7 that

$$\varepsilon_i(\tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} b_\infty) = \varepsilon_i(\tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} b_\lambda)$$

for all $i \in I$. Using this observation, we obtain the following.

Proposition 2.17 (see [F, Remark 5.4 and Corollary 5.20]). *There exists a piecewise-linear function $\psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)}$ of $a_1, \dots, a_r$ for $i \in I$ such that $\varepsilon_i(\tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} b_\infty) = \psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)}(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ for all $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty))$.*

Corollary 2.18. *The following hold.*

(1) *The set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is identical to the set of $(k, a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r$ such that $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}$, and such that $\psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \le \langle k\lambda, h_i \rangle$ for all $i \in I$. In particular, the real closed cone $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is identical to the set of $(k, a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0} \times \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}$ such that $\psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \le \langle k\lambda, h_i \rangle$ for all $i \in I$.*

(2) *The real closed cone $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is a finite union of rational convex polyhedral cones, and the equality $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \cap (\mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r)$ holds.*

Proof. Part (2) is an immediate consequence of part (1); hence it is sufficient to prove part (1). By Proposition 2.10 (3) and Lemma 2.16, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(k\lambda,w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(k\lambda)) &= \{(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty)) \mid \varepsilon_i(\tilde{f}_{i_1}^{a_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r}^{a_r} b_\infty) \le \langle k\lambda, h_i \rangle \text{ for all } i \in I\} \\ &= \{(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathbb{Z}^r \mid \psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \le \langle k\lambda, h_i \rangle \text{ for all } i \in I\} \\ &\quad \text{(by Proposition 2.17 since } \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\infty)) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathbb{Z}^r)\end{aligned}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. This implies the first assertion of part (1). Then, since $\psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)}$ is piecewise-linear, the second assertion of part (1) follows immediately. This proves the corollary. □

By the definition of $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$, we obtain the following from Corollary 2.18 (1).

Corollary 2.19. *The polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is identical to the set of $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}$ such that $\psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)}(a_1, \dots, a_r) \le \langle \lambda, h_i \rangle$ for all $i \in I$.*

Corollary 2.20. *The polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is a finite union of rational convex polytopes, and the equality $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \cap \mathbb{Z}^r = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda))$ holds; here, a subset $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ is called a rational convex polytope if it is a convex hull of a finite number of rational points.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.16, we deduce that $0 \le a_k \le \langle \lambda, h_{i_k} \rangle$, $1 \le k \le r$, for all $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$; therefore, the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is bounded, and hence compact. Also, by Corollary 2.19, the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is given by a finite number of piecewise-linear inequalities. These imply the first assertion of the corollary. Now the second assertion is an immediate consequence of Corollary 2.18 (2). This proves the corollary. □

In Section 4, we will prove that the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is identical to the Newton-Okounkov convex body of a Schubert variety with respect to a specific valuation, and that these are indeed rational convex polytopes. Note that we do not necessarily assume that $(\tilde{\mathbf{i}}, \lambda)$ is ample (see Definition 5.1); when it is ample, we obtain a system of explicit affine inequalities defining the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ (see Corollary 5.3).

3. Newton-Okounkov convex bodies of Schubert varieties

3.1. **Newton-Okounkov convex bodies.** Here we review the definition of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies (following [HK], [Kav], [KK1], and [KK2]). Let R be a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra without nonzero zero-divisors, and fix a total order $<$ on $\mathbb{Z}^r$, $r \ge 1$, respecting the addition.

Definition 3.1. A map $v : R \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{Z}^r$ is called a *valuation* on R if the following hold: for every $\sigma, \tau \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$,

(i) $v(\sigma \cdot \tau) = v(\sigma) + v(\tau)$,
(ii) $v(c \cdot \sigma) = v(\sigma)$,
(iii) $v(\sigma + \tau) \ge \min\{v(\sigma), v(\tau)\}$ unless $\sigma + \tau = 0$.

Note that we need to fix a total order on $\mathbb{Z}^r$ whenever we consider a valuation. The following is a fundamental property of valuations.

Proposition 3.2 (see, for instance, [Kav, Proposition 1.8]). *Let v be a valuation on R. Assume that $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s \in R \setminus \{0\}$, and that $v(\sigma_1), \ldots, v(\sigma_s)$ are all distinct.*

(1) *The elements $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_s$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}$.*
(2) *For $c_1, \ldots, c_s \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sigma := c_1\sigma_1 + \cdots + c_s\sigma_s \neq 0$,*

$$v(\sigma) = \min\{v(\sigma_t) \mid 1 \leq t \leq s,\ c_t \neq 0\}.$$

For $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and a valuation v on R with values in $\mathbb{Z}^r$, we set $R_{\mathbf{a}} := \{\sigma \in R \mid \sigma = 0 \text{ or } v(\sigma) \geq \mathbf{a}\}$; this is a $\mathbb{C}$-subspace of R. The *leaf* above $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ is defined to be the quotient space $\widehat{R}_{\mathbf{a}} := R_{\mathbf{a}} / \bigcup_{\mathbf{a}<\mathbf{b}} R_{\mathbf{b}}$. A valuation v is said to have *one-dimensional leaves* if $\dim(\widehat{R}_{\mathbf{a}}) = 0$ or 1 for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$.

Example 3.3. Define two lexicographic orders $<$ and $\prec$ on $\mathbb{Z}^r$ by $(a_1, \ldots, a_r) < (a'_1, \ldots, a'_r)$ (resp., $(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \prec (a'_1, \ldots, a'_r)$) if and only if there exists $1 \leq k \leq r$ such that $a_1 = a'_1, \ldots, a_{k-1} = a'_{k-1}$, $a_k < a'_k$ (resp., $a_r = a'_r, \ldots, a_{k+1} = a'_{k+1}$, $a_k < a'_k$). Let $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \ldots, t_1)$ denote the rational function field in r variables. The lexicographic order $<$ (resp., $\prec$) on $\mathbb{Z}^r$ induces a total order (denoted by the same symbol $<$ (resp., $\prec$)) on the set of all monomials in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[t_r, \ldots, t_1]$ as follows: $t_r^{a_r} \cdots t_1^{a_1} < t_r^{a'_r} \cdots t_1^{a'_1}$ (resp., $t_r^{a_r} \cdots t_1^{a_1} \prec t_r^{a'_r} \cdots t_1^{a'_1}$) if and only if $(a_1, \ldots, a_r) < (a'_1, \ldots, a'_r)$ (resp., $(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \prec (a'_1, \ldots, a'_r)$). First we consider the case that the fixed total order on $\mathbb{Z}^r$ is the lexicographic order $<$. Let us define a map $v : \mathbb{C}(t_r, \ldots, t_1) \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{Z}^r$ by $v(f/g) := v(f) - v(g)$ for $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[t_r, \ldots, t_1] \setminus \{0\}$, and by

$$v(f) := -(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \text{ for } f = ct_r^{a_r} \cdots t_1^{a_1} + (\text{lower terms}) \in \mathbb{C}[t_r, \ldots, t_1] \setminus \{0\},$$

where $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, and by "lower terms" we mean a linear combination of monomials smaller than $t_r^{a_r} \cdots t_1^{a_1}$ in the total order $<$. It is obvious that v is a valuation with one-dimensional leaves. Since the induced order $<$ on the set of all monomials satisfies $t_1 > \cdots > t_r$, we call the valuation v on $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \ldots, t_1)$ the *highest term valuation with respect to the lexicographic order $t_1 > \cdots > t_r$*. Similarly, the *highest term valuation $\tilde{v}$ with respect to the lexicographic order $t_r \succ \cdots \succ t_1$* is defined to be the valuation on $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \ldots, t_1)$ given by

$$\tilde{v}(f) := -(a_r, \ldots, a_1) \text{ for } f = ct_r^{a_r} \cdots t_1^{a_1} + (\text{lower terms}) \in \mathbb{C}[t_r, \ldots, t_1] \setminus \{0\},$$

where $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, and by "lower terms" we mean a linear combination of monomials smaller than $t_r^{a_r} \cdots t_1^{a_1}$ in the total order $\prec$; note that the induced order $\prec$ on the set of all monomials satisfies $t_r \succ \cdots \succ t_1$. If $r = 3$ and $f = t_1t_2 + t_3^2 \in \mathbb{C}[t_3, t_2, t_1]$, then we have $v(f) = -(1, 1, 0)$ and $\tilde{v}(f) = -(2, 0, 0)$.

Let $V(\lambda)$ be the irreducible highest weight G-module with highest weight λ, and $v_\lambda \in V(\lambda)$ the highest weight vector. Given a dominant integral weight λ, we define a line bundle $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ on G/B by

$$\mathcal{L}_\lambda := (G \times \mathbb{C})/B,$$

where B acts on $G \times \mathbb{C}$ on the right as follows:

$$(g, c) \cdot b = (gb, \lambda(b)c)$$

for $g \in G$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$, and $b \in B$. If we define a morphism $\rho_\lambda : G/B \to \mathbb{P}(V(\lambda))$ by

$$g \bmod B \mapsto \mathbb{C}g \cdot v_\lambda,$$

then we obtain $\rho_\lambda^*(\mathcal{O}(1)) = \mathcal{L}_\lambda$, where $\mathcal{O}(1)$ denotes the twisting sheaf of Serre. Hence the morphism ρ_λ induces a $\mathbb{C}$-linear map

$$\rho_\lambda^* : H^0(\mathbb{P}(V(\lambda)), \mathcal{O}(1)) \to H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda).$$

From the Borel-Weil theorem, we know that this is an isomorphism of G-modules. Here we recall that for an arbitrary finite-dimensional G-module V over $\mathbb{C}$, the space $H^0(\mathbb{P}(V), \mathcal{O}(1))$ of global sections is identified with the dual G-module $V^* := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, \mathbb{C})$. Hence the isomorphism ρ_λ^* is regarded as an isomorphism of G-modules from $V(\lambda)^*$ to $H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$.

Definition 3.4. For $w \in W$, let us denote by $X(w)$ the Zariski closure of $B\widetilde{w}B/B$ in G/B, where $\widetilde{w} \in G$ denotes a lift for w; note that the closed subvariety $X(w)$ is independent of the choice of $\widetilde{w}$. The $X(w)$ is called the *Schubert variety* corresponding to $w \in W$.

It is well-known that $X(w)$ is a normal projective variety of complex dimension $\ell(w)$; here, $\ell(w)$ denotes the length of w. Now the line bundle $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ on G/B induces a line bundle on $X(w)$, which we denote by the same symbol $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$.

Definition 3.5. For $w \in W$ and a dominant integral weight λ, let $v_{w\lambda} \in V(\lambda)$ denote the (extremal) weight vector of weight $w\lambda$. Define a B-submodule $V_w(\lambda) \subset V(\lambda)$ by

$$V_w(\lambda) := \sum_{b \in B} \mathbb{C} b v_{w\lambda};$$

this is called the *Demazure module* corresponding to $w \in W$.

From the Borel-Weil theorem, we know that the space $H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ of global sections is a B-module isomorphic to the dual module $V_w(\lambda)^*$. The *ring of sections* $R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ is the $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$-graded $\mathbb{C}$-algebra obtained from $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ by

$$R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) := \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda^{\otimes k}).$$

If we take a section $\tau \in H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \setminus \{0\}$, then the $\mathbb{C}$-vector space $R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)_k := H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda^{\otimes k})$ can be regarded as a finite-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ as follows:

$$R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)_k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}(X(w)),\ \sigma \mapsto \sigma/\tau^k.$$

Hence a valuation on $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ induces a map from $R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)_k \setminus \{0\}$.

Definition 3.6. For $w \in W$ and a dominant integral weight λ, let $v : \mathbb{C}(X(w)) \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{Z}^r$ be a valuation with one-dimensional leaves with $r := \ell(w)$, and $\tau \in H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \setminus \{0\}$. Define a subset $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau) \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r$ by

$$S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau) := \bigcup_{k>0} \{(k, v(\sigma/\tau^k)) \mid \sigma \in R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)_k \setminus \{0\}\},$$

and denote by $C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^r$ the smallest real closed cone containing $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$. Let us define a subset $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau) \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ by

$$\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau) := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^r \mid (1, \mathbf{a}) \in C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)\};$$

this is called the *Newton-Okounkov convex body* of $X(w)$ associated to $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$, v, and τ.

From the definition of valuations, it is obvious that the set $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ is a semigroup. Therefore, we deduce that the real closed cone $C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ is a closed convex cone, and that the set $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ is a convex set. Moreover, it follows from [KK2, Theorem 2.30] that $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ is a convex body, i.e., a compact convex set. It is well-known that $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ is very ample if and only if λ is a regular dominant integral weight, i.e., $\langle \lambda, h_i \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for all $i \in I$. In this case, the real dimension of $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ is equal to r $(= \ell(w))$ by [KK2, Corollary 3.2]; this is not necessarily the case if λ is not regular.

Remark 3.7. If $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ is a very ample line bundle, then we can take a closed immersion $X(w) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda)^*)$ such that $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ is the pullback of the twisting sheaf $\mathcal{O}(1)$ of Serre. Denote by $R = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} R_k$ the corresponding homogeneous coordinate ring. In many literatures including [HK], Newton-Okounkov convex bodies are defined by using R instead of $R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$. However, since the Schubert variety $X(w)$ is normal, we deduce from [Hart, Chap. II, Ex. 5.14] that $R_k = R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)_k$ for all $k \gg 0$. In addition, since $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ is a semigroup, the real closed cone $C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ is identical to the smallest real closed cone containing

$$\bigcup_{k>k'} \{(k, v(\sigma/\tau^k)) \mid \sigma \in R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)_k \setminus \{0\}\}$$

for $k' \gg 0$. Therefore, R and $R(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ are interchangeable in the definition of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies.

Remark 3.8. If we take another section $\tau' \in H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \setminus \{0\}$, then $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau')$ is the shift of $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ by $kv(\tau/\tau')$ in $\{k\} \times \mathbb{Z}^r$. Hence it follows that $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau') = \Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau) + v(\tau/\tau')$. Thus, the Newton-Okounkov convex body $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v, \tau)$ does not essentially depend on the choice of $\tau \in H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \setminus \{0\}$.

3.2. **Highest term valuations.** In this subsection, we introduce a specific valuation on $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$, which we mainly use. Let P_i (resp., U_i^-) denote the minimal parabolic subgroup (resp., the opposite root subgroup) corresponding to an index $i \in I$, and set $\mathfrak{u}_i^- := \mathrm{Lie}(U_i^-)$. For a reduced word $\mathbf{i} = (i_r, \dots, i_1)$ for $w \in W$, define the *Bott-Samelson variety* $Z_{\mathbf{i}}$ by

$$Z_{\mathbf{i}} := P_{i_r} \times \cdots \times P_{i_1}/B^r,$$

where B^r acts on $P_{i_r} \times \cdots \times P_{i_1}$ on the right by

$$(p_r, \dots, p_1) \cdot (b_r, \dots, b_1) := (p_r b_r, b_r^{-1} p_{r-1} b_{r-1}, \dots, b_2^{-1} p_1 b_1)$$

for $p_r \in P_{i_r}, \dots, p_1 \in P_{i_1}$, and $b_r, \dots, b_1 \in B$. It is well-known that the product map

$$Z_{\mathbf{i}} \to G/B,\ (p_r, \dots, p_1) \bmod B^r \mapsto p_r \cdots p_1 \bmod B, \tag{1}$$

induces a birational morphism onto the Schubert variety $X(w) \subset G/B$; hence a valuation on $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ can be identified with a valuation on $\mathbb{C}(Z_{\mathbf{i}})$. For the identity element $e \in G$, regard $U_{i_r}^- \times \cdots \times U_{i_1}^-$ as an affine open neighborhood of $(e, \dots, e) \bmod B^r$ in $Z_{\mathbf{i}}$ by:

$$U_{i_r}^- \times \cdots \times U_{i_1}^- \hookrightarrow Z_{\mathbf{i}},\ (u_r, \dots, u_1) \mapsto (u_r, \dots, u_1) \bmod B^r. \tag{2}$$

By using the isomorphism of varieties $\mathbb{C}^r \xrightarrow{\sim} U_{i_r}^- \times \cdots \times U_{i_1}^-$, $(t_r, \dots, t_1) \mapsto (\exp(t_r F_{i_r}), \dots, \exp(t_1 F_{i_1}))$, we identify the function field $\mathbb{C}(Z_{\mathbf{i}}) = \mathbb{C}(U_{i_r}^- \times \cdots \times U_{i_1}^-)$ with the rational function field $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \dots, t_1)$. Now we define a valuation $v_{\mathbf{i}}$ on $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ to be the highest term valuation on $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \dots, t_1)$ with respect to the lexicographic order $t_1 > \cdots > t_r$ (see Example 3.3). In the following of this section, we describe $v_{\mathbf{i}}$ in terms of the Chevalley generators. If we set $w_{\geq k} := s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_k}$ for $1 \leq k \leq r$, then we obtain a sequence of subvarieties

$$X(w_{\geq r}) \subset X(w_{\geq r-1}) \subset \cdots \subset X(w_{\geq 1}) = X(w).$$

Note that the product map (1) induces a surjective birational morphism $Z_{(i_r,\dots,i_k)} \twoheadrightarrow X(w_{\geq k})$, and that the open immersion (2) induces an open immersion $U_{i_r}^- \times \cdots \times U_{i_k}^- \hookrightarrow Z_{(i_r,\dots,i_k)}$, where $Z_{(i_r,\dots,i_k)}$ denotes the Bott-Samelson variety corresponding to the reduced word $(i_r, \dots, i_k)$; hence the function field $\mathbb{C}(X(w_{\geq k}))$ is identified with the rational function field $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \dots, t_k)$. Consider the right action of $U_{i_k}^-$ on $U_{i_r}^- \times \cdots \times U_{i_k}^-$ given by $(u_r, \dots, u_k) \cdot u = (u_r, \dots, u_k u)$ for $u, u_k \in U_{i_k}^-, u_{k+1} \in U_{i_{k+1}}^-, \dots, u_r \in U_{i_r}^-$; this induces right actions of $U_{i_k}^-$ and $\mathfrak{u}_{i_k}^-$ on $\mathbb{C}[t_r, \dots, t_k] = \mathbb{C}[U_{i_r}^- \times \cdots \times U_{i_k}^-]$, which are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} &f(t_r, \dots, t_k) \cdot \exp(sF_{i_k}) = f(t_r, \dots, t_{k+1}, t_k - s), \text{ and hence} \\ &f(t_r, \dots, t_k) \cdot F_{i_k} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t_k} f(t_r, \dots, t_k) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

for $s \in \mathbb{C}$ and $f(t_r, \dots, t_k) \in \mathbb{C}[t_r, \dots, t_k]$.

Proposition 3.9. *For $f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \in \mathbb{C}[t_r, \dots, t_1]$, write $v_{\mathbf{i}}(f(t_r, \dots, t_1)) = -(a_1, \dots, a_r)$. Then, there hold the equalities*

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \cdot F_{i_1}^a \neq 0\}, \\ a_2 &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid (f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \cdot F_{i_1}^{a_1})|_{X(w_{\geq 2})} \cdot F_{i_2}^a \neq 0\}, \\ &\vdots \\ a_r &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid (\cdots((f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \cdot F_{i_1}^{a_1})|_{X(w_{\geq 2})} \cdot F_{i_2}^{a_2}) \cdots)|_{X(w_{\geq r})} \cdot F_{i_r}^a \neq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of $v_{\mathbf{i}}$ that a_1 is equal to the degree of $f(t_r, \dots, t_1)$ with respect to the variable t_1. Therefore, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \frac{\partial^a}{\partial t_1^a} f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \neq 0\} \\ &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \cdot F_{i_1}^a \neq 0\} \quad \text{(by equation (3))}. \end{aligned}$$

We remark that since the polynomial $f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \cdot F_{i_1}^{a_1}$ does not contain the variable t_1, the restriction $(f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \cdot F_{i_1}^{a_1})|_{X(w_{\geq 2})}$ is identical to $f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \cdot F_{i_1}^{a_1} \in \mathbb{C}[t_r, \dots, t_2]$ as a polynomial in the variables $t_r, \dots, t_2$; here the restriction map $\mathbb{C}(X(w)) \to \mathbb{C}(X(w_{\geq 2}))$ is given by $t_1 \mapsto 0$. Hence we see from the definition of $v_{\mathbf{i}}$ that $v_{(i_r,\dots,i_2)}((f(t_r, \dots, t_1) \cdot F_{i_1}^{a_1})|_{X(w_{\geq 2})}) = -(a_2, \dots, a_r)$, where $v_{(i_r,\dots,i_2)}$ denotes the valuation on $\mathbb{C}(X(w_{\geq 2}))$ defined to be the highest term valuation on $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \dots, t_2)$ $(= \mathbb{C}(U_{i_r}^- \times \cdots \times U_{i_2}^-))$ with respect to the lexicographic order $t_2 > \cdots > t_r$. By induction on $r = \ell(w)$, the assertion of the proposition follows. □

4. Main result

4.1. **Statement of the main result.** If we regard $\mathbb{C}$ as a $\mathbb{Q}[q,q^{-1}]$-module by the natural $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra homomorphism $\mathbb{Q}[q,q^{-1}] \to \mathbb{C}$, $q \mapsto 1$, then the $\mathbb{C}$-vector space $V_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}[q,q^{-1}]} \mathbb{C}$ has a $\mathfrak{g}$-module structure given by

$$E_i(v \otimes c) := (e_i v) \otimes c,\ F_i(v \otimes c) := (f_i v) \otimes c,\ h_i(v \otimes c) := \left(\frac{t_i - t_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} v\right) \otimes c$$

for $i \in I$, $v \in V_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)$, and $c \in \mathbb{C}$; this $\mathfrak{g}$-module is isomorphic to $V(\lambda)$ (see, for instance, [J2, Lemma 5.14]). We denote by $G_\lambda^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \in V(\lambda)$ the specialization of $G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(b)$ at $q=1$, i.e., $G_\lambda^{\mathrm{low}}(b) := G_{q,\lambda}^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \otimes 1 \in V_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}[q,q^{-1}]} \mathbb{C} \simeq V(\lambda)$. Then, Proposition 2.10 (4) implies that the set $\{G_\lambda^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)\}$ forms a $\mathbb{C}$-basis of the Demazure module $V_w(\lambda)$. Also, we denote by $\{G_{\lambda,w}^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)\} \subset V_w(\lambda)^* = H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ the dual basis, and by $\tau_\lambda \in V(\lambda)^* = H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ the lowest weight vector such that $\tau_\lambda(v_\lambda) = 1$; by restricting the section τ_λ, we obtain a section in $H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$, which we denote by the same symbol τ_λ. The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathbf{i} \in I^r$ be a reduced word for $w \in W$, and λ a dominant integral weight. Then, $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}(b) = -v_{\mathbf{i}}(G_{\lambda,w}^{\mathrm{up}}(b)/\tau_\lambda)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$.*

We give a proof of this theorem in the next subsection.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\omega : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^r \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^r$ be the linear automorphism given by $\omega(k, \mathbf{a}) = (k, -\mathbf{a})$. Then, $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = \omega(S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda))$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = \omega(C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda))$, and $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = -\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{\otimes k} = \mathcal{L}_{k\lambda}$ and $\tau_\lambda^k = \tau_{k\lambda}$ in $H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_{k\lambda})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, it follows that

$$S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda) = \bigcup_{k>0} \{(k, v_{\mathbf{i}}(\sigma/\tau_{k\lambda})) \mid \sigma \in H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_{k\lambda}) \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

Also, since $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(k\lambda,w)}(b)$, $b \in \mathcal{B}_w(k\lambda)$, are all distinct, we deduce from Proposition 3.2 (2) and Theorem 4.1 that

$$\{\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(k\lambda,w)}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_w(k\lambda)\} = \{-v_{\mathbf{i}}(\sigma/\tau_{k\lambda}) \mid \sigma \in H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_{k\lambda}) \setminus \{0\}\}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, which implies that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = \omega(S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda))$. From this equality, the other assertions follow immediately by the definitions. □

Corollary 4.3. *Let $\mathbf{i} \in I^r$ be a reduced word for $w \in W$, and λ a dominant integral weight.*

1. *The sets $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ and $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$ are both finitely generated semigroups.*
2. *The real closed cones $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ and $C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$ are both rational convex polyhedral cones, and the equality $S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda) = C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda) \cap (\mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r)$ holds.*
3. *The compact sets $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ and $\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$ are both rational convex polytopes, and the equality $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)) = -\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda) \cap \mathbb{Z}^r$ holds.*

Proof. Part (2) follows from Corollary 2.18 (2) and from the fact that $C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$ is convex. Then, part (3) is an immediate consequence of part (2) and Corollary 2.20. Finally, part (1) follows from part (2) and from Gordan's lemma (see, for instance, [CLS, Proposition 1.2.17]). □

4.2. **Proof of Theorem 4.1.** We make use of the lower global basis of $U_q(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. Let $U^- \subset G$ be the unipotent radical of the opposite Borel subgroup, $\mathfrak{u}^- \subset \mathfrak{g}$ the Lie algebra of U^-, and $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{u}^-$; this $\mathbb{C}$-algebra is isomorphic to $U_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{u}^-) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}[q,q^{-1}]} \mathbb{C}$ by identifying F_i with $f_i \otimes 1$. For $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, denote by $G^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \in U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ the specialization of $G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b)$ at $q=1$, i.e., $G^{\mathrm{low}}(b) := G_q^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \otimes 1 \in U_q^{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathfrak{u}^-) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}[q,q^{-1}]} \mathbb{C} \simeq U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. The algebra $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ has a Hopf algebra structure given by the following coproduct Δ, counit ε, and antipode S:

$$\Delta(F_i) = F_i \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes F_i,\ \varepsilon(F_i) = 0, \text{ and } S(F_i) = -F_i$$

for $i \in I$. Also, we can regard $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ as a multigraded $\mathbb{C}$-algebra:

$$U(\mathfrak{u}^-) = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^I} U(\mathfrak{u}^-)_{\mathbf{d}},$$

where the homogeneous component $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)_{\mathbf{d}}$ for $\mathbf{d} = (d_i)_{i\in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^I$ is defined to be the $\mathbb{C}$-subspace of $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ spanned by elements $F_{j_1}\cdots F_{j_{|\mathbf{d}|}}$ for which the cardinality of $\{1 \leq l \leq |\mathbf{d}| \mid j_l = i\}$ is equal to d_i for all $i \in I$; here we set $|\mathbf{d}| := \sum_{i\in I} d_i$. Let

$$U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}} := \bigoplus_{\mathbf{d}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^I} U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathbf{d}}$$

be the graded dual of $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ endowed with the dual Hopf algebra structure, and $\{G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)\} \subset U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}}$ the dual basis of $\{G^{\mathrm{low}}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)\} \subset U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. Proposition 2.8 (2) implies that $\pi_\lambda(G^{\mathrm{low}}(b)) = G^{\mathrm{low}}_\lambda(\pi_\lambda(b))$ for all $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$, and that $\pi_\lambda(G^{\mathrm{low}}(b)) = 0$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)\backslash\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$, where by abuse of notation, we denote by $\pi_\lambda : U(\mathfrak{u}^-) \twoheadrightarrow V(\lambda)$ the surjective $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$-module homomorphism given by $\pi_\lambda(u) = u \cdot v_\lambda$ for $u \in U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. Hence we obtain $\pi^*_\lambda(G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(\pi_\lambda(b))) = G^{\mathrm{up}}(b)$ for all $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$, where $\pi^*_\lambda : V(\lambda)^* \hookrightarrow U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}}$ denotes the dual of π_λ. Note that the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$ has a Hopf algebra structure given by the following coproduct Δ, counit ε, and antipode S:

$$\Delta(f)(u_1 \otimes u_2) = f(u_1u_2),\ \varepsilon(f) = f(1),\ \text{and } S(f)(u) = f(u^{-1})$$

for $f \in \mathbb{C}[U^-]$ and $u, u_1, u_2 \in U^-$. It is well-known that this Hopf algebra is isomorphic to the dual Hopf algebra $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}}$ as follows.

Lemma 4.4 (see, for instance, [GLS, Proposition 5.1])**.** *Define a map $\Upsilon : U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}} \to \mathbb{C}[U^-]$ by $\Upsilon(\rho)(\exp(x)) = \sum_{l\geq 0} \rho(x^l)/l!$ for $\rho \in U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}}$ and $x \in \mathfrak{u}^-$; here, $\exp(x) \in U^-$ and $x^l \in U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$ for all $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then, the map Υ is an isomorphism of Hopf algebras.*

Using the isomorphism Υ, we identify $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}}$ with $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$. Then, the space $H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ of global sections can be regarded as a $\mathbb{C}$-subspace of $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$ by: $H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda) = V(\lambda)^* \xhookrightarrow{\pi^*_\lambda} U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}} = \mathbb{C}[U^-]$. Also, we can regard U^- as an affine open subset of G/B by:

$$U^- \hookrightarrow G/B,\ u \mapsto u \bmod B;$$

hence we obtain an isomorphism

$$\mathbb{C}(G/B) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}(U^-),\ f \mapsto f|_{U^-}.$$

Lemma 4.5. *The equality $(\tau/\tau_\lambda)|_{U^-} = (\Upsilon \circ \pi^*_\lambda)(\tau)$ holds in $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$ for all $\tau \in H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$. In particular, the restriction of $G^{\mathrm{up}}_\lambda(\pi_\lambda(b))/\tau_\lambda$ to U^- is identical to $\Upsilon(G^{\mathrm{up}}(b)) \in \mathbb{C}[U^-]$ for all $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Because $\exp(x)\cdot v_\lambda \in v_\lambda + x\cdot V(\lambda)$ and $\tau_\lambda(x\cdot V(\lambda)) = \{0\}$ for $x \in \mathfrak{u}^-$, we have $\tau_\lambda(\exp(x)\cdot v_\lambda) = 1$. Therefore, as an element of $H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$, the section τ_λ does not vanish on U^- ($\hookrightarrow G/B$); in particular, $(\tau/\tau_\lambda)|_{U^-} \in \mathbb{C}[U^-]$. Furthermore, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(\tau/\tau_\lambda)(\exp(x)) &= \tau(\exp(x)\cdot v_\lambda)/\tau_\lambda(\exp(x)\cdot v_\lambda)\\ &\quad\text{(by the definition of the isomorphism } \rho^*_\lambda : V(\lambda)^* \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \text{ in §§3.1)}\\ &= \tau(\exp(x)\cdot v_\lambda) \quad (\text{since } \tau_\lambda(\exp(x)\cdot v_\lambda) = 1).\end{aligned}$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\Upsilon \circ \pi^*_\lambda)(\tau)(\exp(x)) &= \sum_{l\geq 0} (\pi^*_\lambda(\tau))(x^l)/l! \quad (\text{by the definition of } \Upsilon)\\ &= \sum_{l\geq 0} \tau(x^l \cdot v_\lambda)/l! \quad (\text{since } \pi_\lambda(x^l) = x^l \cdot v_\lambda)\\ &= \tau(\exp(x)\cdot v_\lambda).\end{aligned}$$

From these, the assertion of the lemma follows immediately. □

Let $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle : U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}} \times U(\mathfrak{u}^-) \to \mathbb{C}$ denote the canonical pairing. Define a $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$-bimodule structure on $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle x\cdot\rho, y\rangle &:= -\langle\rho, x\cdot y\rangle, \text{ and}\\ \langle\rho\cdot x, y\rangle &:= -\langle\rho, y\cdot x\rangle\end{aligned}$$

for $x \in \mathfrak{u}^-$, $\rho \in U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}}$, and $y \in U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. Also, the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$ has a natural U^--bimodule structure, which is given by

$$(u_1 \cdot f)(u_2) := f(u_1^{-1}u_2), \text{ and}$$
$$(f \cdot u_1)(u_2) := f(u_2u_1^{-1})$$

for $u_1, u_2 \in U^-$ and $f \in \mathbb{C}[U^-]$. This induces a $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$-bimodule structure on $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$. Note that Υ is an isomorphism of $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$-bimodules.

Lemma 4.6. *For $k \geq 0$, $i \in I$, and $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$,*

$$F_i^{(k)} \cdot G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \in (-1)^k \binom{\varepsilon_i(b)}{k} G^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde{e}_i^k b) + \sum_{\substack{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty);\ \mathrm{wt}(b') = \mathrm{wt}(\tilde{e}_i^k b), \\ \varepsilon_i(b') < \varepsilon_i(\tilde{e}_i^k b)}} \mathbb{Z} G^{\mathrm{up}}(b'), \text{ and}$$

$$G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^{(k)} \in (-1)^k \binom{\varepsilon_i^*(b)}{k} G^{\mathrm{up}}((\tilde{e}_i^*)^k b) + \sum_{\substack{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty);\ \mathrm{wt}(b') = \mathrm{wt}((\tilde{e}_i^*)^k b), \\ \varepsilon_i^*(b') < \varepsilon_i^*((\tilde{e}_i^*)^k b)}} \mathbb{Z} G^{\mathrm{up}}(b').$$

Here, $F_i^{(k)} := F_i^k/k!$, and $\binom{\varepsilon_i(b)}{k}$, $\binom{\varepsilon_i^*(b)}{k}$ are usual binomial coefficients. In particular, there hold the equalities

$$\varepsilon_i(b) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid F_i^{(k)} \cdot G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \neq 0\},\ F_i^{(\varepsilon_i(b))} \cdot G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) = (-1)^{\varepsilon_i(b)} G^{\mathrm{up}}(\tilde{e}_i^{\varepsilon_i(b)} b), \text{ and}$$
$$\varepsilon_i^*(b) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^{(k)} \neq 0\},\ G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^{(\varepsilon_i^*(b))} = (-1)^{\varepsilon_i^*(b)} G^{\mathrm{up}}((\tilde{e}_i^*)^{\varepsilon_i^*(b)} b).$$

Proof. We prove only the assertion for $G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^{(k)}$; the proof of the assertion for $F_i^{(k)} \cdot G^{\mathrm{up}}(b)$ is similar. For $b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, the coefficient of $G^{\mathrm{up}}(b')$ in $G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^{(k)}$ is equal to

$$\langle G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^{(k)}, G^{\mathrm{low}}(b') \rangle = (-1)^k \langle G^{\mathrm{up}}(b), G^{\mathrm{low}}(b') \cdot F_i^{(k)} \rangle.$$

If $\langle G^{\mathrm{up}}(b), G^{\mathrm{low}}(b') \cdot F_i^{(k)} \rangle \neq 0$, then we see that $\mathrm{wt}(b) = \mathrm{wt}((\tilde{f}_i^*)^k b')$, i.e., $\mathrm{wt}(b') = \mathrm{wt}((\tilde{e}_i^*)^k b)$ by the definition of the graded dual $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}}$. Moreover, in this case, Proposition 2.8 (4) implies that $b = (\tilde{f}_i^*)^k b'$ or $\varepsilon_i^*(b) > \varepsilon_i^*((\tilde{f}_i^*)^k b')$, i.e., $b' = (\tilde{e}_i^*)^k b$ or $\varepsilon_i^*(b') < \varepsilon_i^*((\tilde{e}_i^*)^k b)$. Therefore, we deduce that

$$G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^{(k)} \in \mathbb{C} G^{\mathrm{up}}((\tilde{e}_i^*)^k b) + \sum_{\substack{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty);\ \mathrm{wt}(b') = \mathrm{wt}((\tilde{e}_i^*)^k b), \\ \varepsilon_i^*(b') < \varepsilon_i^*((\tilde{e}_i^*)^k b)}} \mathbb{C} G^{\mathrm{up}}(b').$$

The claim for the coefficients also follows from the same proposition. □

Note that in Lemma 4.6, $F_i^{(k)} \cdot G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \neq 0$ (resp., $G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^{(k)} \neq 0$) if and only if $F_i^k \cdot G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \neq 0$ (resp., $G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^k \neq 0$) since $F_i^{(k)} = F_i^k/k!$.

If $w_0 \in W$ is the longest element, then the Schubert variety $X(w_0)$ is just the full flag variety G/B. For a reduced word $\mathbf{i} = (i_N, \ldots, i_1)$ for w_0, we deduce from the argument in §§3.2 that the product map

$$U^-_{i_N} \times \cdots \times U^-_{i_1} \to U^-,\ (u_N, \ldots, u_1) \mapsto u_N \cdots u_1,$$

is birational, and hence that the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$ can be regarded as a $\mathbb{C}$-subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}[U^-_{i_N} \times \cdots \times U^-_{i_1}] = \mathbb{C}[t_N, \ldots, t_1]$. In this way, we think of $G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \in U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}} = \mathbb{C}[U^-]$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ as a polynomial in the variables $t_N, \ldots, t_1$.

Proposition 4.7. *For a reduced word $\mathbf{i} = (i_N, \ldots, i_1)$ for w_0 and $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, the Kashiwara embedding $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)$ is equal to $-v_{\mathbf{i}}(G^{\mathrm{up}}(b))$.*

Proof. First, observe that the right action of F_{i_1} on $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$ ($\hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}[U^-_{i_N} \times \cdots \times U^-_{i_1}]$), which is induced by the right $U(\mathfrak{u}^-)$-module structure on $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$, is identical to that of F_{i_1} on $\mathbb{C}[U^-_{i_N} \times \cdots \times U^-_{i_1}]$, which is defined in §§3.2. Therefore, if we write $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(b) = (a_1, \ldots, a_N)$ and $v_{\mathbf{i}}(G^{\mathrm{up}}(b)) = -(a'_1, \ldots, a'_N)$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, then we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} a'_1 &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_{i_1}^a \neq 0\} \quad \text{(by Proposition 3.9)} \\ &= \max\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid (\tilde{e}_{i_1}^*)^a b \neq 0\} \quad \text{(by the assertion of Lemma 4.6 for } \varepsilon_i^*(b)) \\ &= a_1 \quad \text{(by Proposition 2.11 (2)).} \end{aligned}$$

Repeating this argument, with b and U^- replaced by $(\tilde{e}_{i_1}^*)^{a_1}b$ and $\overline{U_{i_N}^- \cdots U_{i_2}^-}$ ($\subset U^-$), respectively, we obtain $(a_1', \dots, a_N') = (a_1, \dots, a_N)$; here we use the equality

$$G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_{i_1}^{(a_1)} = (-1)^{a_1} G^{\mathrm{up}}((\tilde{e}_{i_1}^*)^{a_1} b) \quad \text{(by the assertion of Lemma 4.6 for } G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_i^{(\varepsilon_i^*(b))})$$

and the fact that the restriction of $G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_{i_1}^{(a_1)}$ to $\overline{U_{i_N}^- \cdots U_{i_2}^-}$ is identical to $G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \cdot F_{i_1}^{(a_1)} \in \mathbb{C}[t_N, \dots, t_2]$ as a polynomial in the variables $t_N, \dots, t_2$ (see also the proof of Proposition 3.9). This proves the proposition. □

Since $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)$, $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, are all distinct, we obtain the following from Proposition 3.2 (2).

Corollary 4.8. *The polyhedral realization $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$ is identical to $-v_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}[U^-] \setminus \{0\})$.*

Recall that the map $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda, w_0)}$ (see Definition 2.14) gives an embedding of $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ into $\mathbb{Z}^N$, which we denote simply by $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda)}$. It follows from the definition of $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda, w_0)}$ that $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda)}(\pi_\lambda(b)) = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)$ for all $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$. Hence we obtain the following by Lemma 4.5.

Corollary 4.9. *The Kashiwara embedding $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda)}(b)$ is equal to $-v_{\mathbf{i}}(G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)/\tau_\lambda)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$.*

We remark that this corollary is precisely the assertion of Theorem 4.1 in the case $w = w_0$. In the rest of this subsection, we give a proof of Theorem 4.1 for an arbitrary $w \in W$. Let $\mathbf{i} = (i_r, \dots, i_1)$ be a reduced word for w, and extend it to a reduced word $\hat{\mathbf{i}} = (i_N, \dots, i_{r+1}, i_r, \dots, i_1)$ for w_0. By the same argument as the one preceding Proposition 4.7, the reduced word $\hat{\mathbf{i}}$ gives an injective $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism $\mathbb{C}[U^-] \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}[t_N, \dots, t_1]$. Moreover, the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[X(w) \cap U^-]$ can be identified with a $\mathbb{C}$-subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}[t_r, \dots, t_1]$ ($\subset \mathbb{C}[t_N, \dots, t_1]$) by using the birational morphism

$$U_{i_r}^- \times \cdots \times U_{i_1}^- \to X(w) \cap U^-, \ (u_r, \dots, u_1) \mapsto u_r \cdots u_1 \bmod B;$$

note that the restriction map $\mathbb{C}[U^-] \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[X(w) \cap U^-]$ is given by

$$t_k \mapsto \begin{cases} t_k & \text{if } 1 \le k \le r, \\ 0 & \text{if } r+1 \le k \le N. \end{cases}$$

Also, recall that the highest term valuation $v_{\hat{\mathbf{i}}}$ (resp., $v_{\mathbf{i}}$) is a valuation on $\mathbb{C}(t_N, \dots, t_1)$ (resp., $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \dots, t_1)$). For $b \in \mathcal{B}_w(\lambda)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -v_{\hat{\mathbf{i}}}(G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)/\tau_\lambda) &= \Psi_{\hat{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(b) \quad \text{(by Corollary 4.9)} \\ &= (\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda, w)}(b), \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N-r}) \quad \text{(by Definition 2.14).} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the highest term of $G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)/\tau_\lambda \in \mathbb{C}[t_N, \dots, t_1]$ with respect to the lexicographic order $t_1 > \cdots > t_N$ does not contain the variables t_k for $r+1 \le k \le N$, which implies that

$$-v_{\mathbf{i}}((G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)/\tau_\lambda)|_{X(w) \cap U^-}) = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda, w)}(b).$$

Now we remark that the restriction map $V(\lambda)^* = H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \to H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda) = V_w(\lambda)^*$ is identical to the dual of the inclusion map $V_w(\lambda) \hookrightarrow V(\lambda)$. This implies that $G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)|_{X(w)} = G_{\lambda,w}^{\mathrm{up}}(b)$, and hence that $(G_\lambda^{\mathrm{up}}(b)/\tau_\lambda)|_{X(w) \cap U^-} = G_{\lambda,w}^{\mathrm{up}}(b)/\tau_\lambda$; here recall that the section $\tau_\lambda \in H^0(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ is defined to be the restriction of the section $\tau_\lambda \in H^0(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda)$. Thus, we obtain $-v_{\mathbf{i}}(G_{\lambda,w}^{\mathrm{up}}(b)/\tau_\lambda) = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda, w)}(b)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

5. Applications

5.1. **Explicit forms of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies.** Under the assumption that $(\tilde{\mathbf{i}}, \lambda)$ is ample (see Definition 5.1 below), the polyhedral realization $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda))$ in §§2.3 is given by a system of explicit affine inequalities. In order to obtain explicit forms of Newton-Okounkov convex bodies, we recall the description of $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda))$, following [N1] and [N2]. Consider the infinite-dimensional vector space

$$\mathbb{Q}^\infty := \{\mathbf{a} = (\dots, a_k, \dots, a_2, a_1) \mid a_k \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ and } a_k = 0 \text{ for } k \gg 0\},$$

and write an affine function ψ on $\mathbb{Q}^\infty$ as $\psi(\mathbf{a}) = \psi_0 + \sum_{k \ge 1} \psi_k a_k$, with $\psi_0, \psi_1, \dots \in \mathbb{Q}$. Recall that $\mathbf{i} = (i_r, \dots, i_1)$ is a reduced word for $w \in W$, and that $\tilde{\mathbf{i}} = (\dots, i_k, \dots, i_{r+1}, i_r, \dots, i_1)$ is an extension of

$\mathbf{i}$ such that $i_k \neq i_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$, and such that the cardinality of $\{k \geq 1 \mid i_k = i\}$ is ∞ for each $i \in I$. For $k \geq 1$, we set

$$k^{(+)} := \min\{l > k \mid i_l = i_k\}, \text{ and}$$
$$k^{(-)} := \begin{cases} \max\{l < k \mid i_l = i_k\} & \text{if it exists,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $k \geq 1$ and $i \in I$, let $\beta_k^{(\pm)}(\mathbf{a})$, $\lambda^{(i)}(\mathbf{a})$ denote the affine functions given by

$$\beta_k^{(+)}(\mathbf{a}) := a_k + \sum_{k<j<k^{(+)}} \langle \alpha_{i_j}, h_{i_k} \rangle a_j + a_{k^{(+)}},$$
$$\beta_k^{(-)}(\mathbf{a}) := \begin{cases} a_{k^{(-)}} + \sum_{k^{(-)}<j<k} \langle \alpha_{i_j}, h_{i_k} \rangle a_j + a_k & \text{if } k^{(-)} > 0, \\ -\langle \lambda, h_{i_k} \rangle + \sum_{1 \leq j < k} \langle \alpha_{i_j}, h_{i_k} \rangle a_j + a_k & \text{if } k^{(-)} = 0, \end{cases}$$
$$\lambda^{(i)}(\mathbf{a}) := \langle \lambda, h_i \rangle - \sum_{1 \leq j < \tilde{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)}} \langle \alpha_{i_j}, h_i \rangle a_j - a_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)}},$$

where we write $\tilde{\mathbf{i}}^{(i)} := \min\{k \geq 1 \mid i_k = i\}$. Define operators $\widehat{S}_k$, $k \geq 1$, for affine functions on $\mathbb{Q}^\infty$ by

$$\widehat{S}_k(\psi) := \begin{cases} \psi - \psi_k \beta_k^{(+)} & \text{if } \psi_k > 0, \\ \psi - \psi_k \beta_k^{(-)} & \text{if } \psi_k \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

and let $\Xi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda]$ denote the set of all affine functions generated by $\widehat{S}_k$, $k \geq 1$, from the functions a_j, $j \geq 1$, and $\lambda^{(i)}(\mathbf{a})$, $i \in I$; namely,

$$\Xi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda] := \{\widehat{S}_{j_k} \cdots \widehat{S}_{j_1} a_{j_0} \mid k \geq 0 \text{ and } j_0, \ldots, j_k \geq 1\}$$
$$\cup \{\widehat{S}_{j_k} \cdots \widehat{S}_{j_1} \lambda^{(i)}(\mathbf{a}) \mid k \geq 0,\ i \in I, \text{ and } j_1, \ldots, j_k \geq 1\}.$$

Definition 5.1. Set

$$\Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda] := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^\infty[\lambda] \subset \mathbb{Q}^\infty \mid \psi(\mathbf{a}) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \psi \in \Xi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda]\};$$

a pair $(\tilde{\mathbf{i}}, \lambda)$ is called *ample* if $(\ldots, 0, \ldots, 0, 0) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda]$.

Proposition 5.2 (see [N1, Theorem 4.1] and [N2, Proposition 3.1])**.** *Assume that $(\tilde{\mathbf{i}}, \lambda)$ is ample. Then, the image $\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathcal{B}_w(\lambda))$ is identical to the set*

$$\{(\ldots, a_k, \ldots, a_2, a_1) \in \Sigma_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda] \mid a_k = 0 \text{ for all } k > r\}.$$

For all $\psi \in \Xi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda]$, the constant term $\psi(\ldots, 0, \ldots, 0, 0)$ is regarded as a linear function of λ by the definition of $\Xi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda]$; hence, for a fixed dominant integral weight λ, we can regard an element of $\Xi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[k\lambda]$ as a linear function of k and a_j, $j \geq 1$. Therefore, we obtain the following from Definitions 2.14, 2.15 and Corollary 4.2.

Corollary 5.3. *Assume that $(\tilde{\mathbf{i}}, \lambda)$ is ample. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} &= \omega(S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)) \\ &= \{(k, a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r \mid \psi(\ldots, 0, 0, a_r, \ldots, a_1) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \psi \in \Xi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[k\lambda]\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} &= \omega(C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)) \\ &= \{(k, a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^r \mid \psi(\ldots, 0, 0, a_r, \ldots, a_1) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \psi \in \Xi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[k\lambda]\}, \text{ and} \\ \Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} &= -\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda) \\ &= \{(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r \mid \psi(\ldots, 0, 0, a_r, \ldots, a_1) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \psi \in \Xi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}[\lambda]\}. \end{aligned}$$

5.2. **Relation with Kashiwara's involution.** This subsection is devoted to describing Kashiwara's involution $*$ in terms of valuations on the rational function field. We first recall the main result of [Kav]. Let $\mathbf{i} = (i_r, \dots, i_1)$ be a reduced word for $w \in W$, and $\Phi_{\mathbf{i}} : \mathcal{B}_w(\infty) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ the corresponding string parameterization (see §§2.3). We set

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} := \bigcup_{k>0} \{(k, \Phi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)) \mid b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_w(k\lambda)\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r,$$

and denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^r$ the smallest real closed cone containing $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$; here we write $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_w(k\lambda) := \mathcal{B}_w(\infty) \cap \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}(k\lambda)$.

Definition 5.4 (see [Lit, Section 1] and [Kav, Definition 3.5])**.** Let $\mathbf{i} \in I^r$ be a reduced word for $w \in W$, and λ a dominant integral weight. Define a subset $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ by

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^r \mid (1, \mathbf{a}) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}\};$$

this is called the *string polytope* associated to λ, w, and $\mathbf{i}$.

Lemma 5.5 (see [Lit, Section 1])**.** *For $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$, there hold the inequalities*

$$0 \leq a_r \leq \langle \lambda, h_{i_r} \rangle,\ 0 \leq a_{r-1} \leq \langle \lambda - a_r \alpha_{i_r}, h_{i_{r-1}} \rangle, \dots, 0 \leq a_1 \leq \langle \lambda - a_r \alpha_{i_r} - \cdots - a_2 \alpha_{i_2}, h_{i_1} \rangle.$$

In particular, the string polytope $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is bounded, and hence compact.

Proposition 5.6 (see [BZ, §§3.2 and Theorem 3.10])**.** *Let $\mathbf{i} \in I^r$ be a reduced word for $w \in W$, and λ a dominant integral weight. Then, the real closed cone $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is a rational convex polyhedral cone, and the equality $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \cap (\mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}^r)$ holds. In particular, the string polytope $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)}$ is a rational convex polytope, and the equality $\Phi_{\mathbf{i}}(\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_w(\lambda)) = \widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} \cap \mathbb{Z}^r$ holds.*

We identify the function field $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ with the rational function field $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \dots, t_1)$ as in §§3.2, and define a valuation $\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}$ on $\mathbb{C}(X(w))$ to be the highest term valuation on $\mathbb{C}(t_r, \dots, t_1)$ with respect to the lexicographic order $t_r \succ \cdots \succ t_1$ (see Example 3.3). The following is the main result of [Kav].

Proposition 5.7 (see [Kav, Theorem 4.1, Corollary 4.2, and Remark 4.6])**.** *Let $\mathbf{i} \in I^r$ be a reduced word for $w \in W$, and λ a dominant integral weight.*

1. *The string parameterization $\Phi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)$ is equal to $-\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}(G^{\mathrm{up}}_{\lambda,w}(\pi_\lambda(b))/\tau_\lambda)$ for all $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}_w(\lambda)$.*
2. *Define the linear automorphism $\omega : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^r \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^r$ by $\omega(k, \mathbf{a}) = (k, -\mathbf{a})$. Then, $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = \omega(S(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, \tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda))$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = \omega(C(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, \tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda))$, and $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w)} = -\Delta(X(w), \mathcal{L}_\lambda, \tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$.*

In the rest of this subsection, we consider the case that $w = w_0$. For a reduced word $\mathbf{i} = (i_N, \dots, i_1)$ for w_0, Lemma 4.5 and Proposition 5.7 (1) imply that

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{i}}(b) = -\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}(G^{\mathrm{up}}(b))$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, where we identify $G^{\mathrm{up}}(b) \in U(\mathfrak{u}^-)^*_{\mathrm{gr}}$ with $\Upsilon(G^{\mathrm{up}}(b)) \in \mathbb{C}[U^-]$ $(\subset \mathbb{C}[t_N, \dots, t_1])$. Since $\Phi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)$, $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, are all distinct, we deduce from Proposition 3.2 (2) that

$$\Phi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty)) = -\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}[U^-] \setminus \{0\}).$$

Now the equality $\Phi_{\mathbf{i}} = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}} \circ *$ (by Proposition 2.11 (2)) implies that this set is also identical to the set

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty)) = -v_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}(\mathbb{C}[U^-] \setminus \{0\}) \quad \text{(by Corollary 4.8)},$$

where $\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}} := (i_1, \dots, i_N)$, which is a reduced word for $w_0^{-1} = w_0$. Let $\eta_{\mathbf{i}} : \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty)) \to \Phi_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$ $(= \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty)))$ be the transition map given by $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}(\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)) = \Phi_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}(b)$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$. Then, we see that Kashiwara's involution $*$ corresponds to the map $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}$ through the Kashiwara embedding $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}$:

$$b^* = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{-1} \circ \eta_{\mathbf{i}} \circ \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$. Take an extension $\tilde{\mathbf{i}} = (\dots, i_k, \dots, i_{N+1}, i_N, \dots, i_1)$ of $\mathbf{i}$ as in §§2.3. It follows from the definition of the crystal $\mathbb{Z}^\infty_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{e}_i^{\max}\mathbf{a} &= \big(a_k - \delta_{i,i_k}\big(a_k - \varphi_i(\mathbf{a}_{\geq k+1})\big)\big)_{k \geq 1} \\ &= \big((1 - \delta_{i,i_k})a_k + \delta_{i,i_k}\big(\sigma^{(i)}(\mathbf{a}_{\geq k+1}) + \langle \mathrm{wt}(\mathbf{a}_{\geq k+1}), h_i \rangle\big)\big)_{k \geq 1} \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in I$ and $\mathbf{a} = (\dots, a_k, \dots, a_2, a_1) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{\infty}$, where we set $\mathbf{a}_{\geq k} := (\dots, a_{k+1}, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{(\dots, i_{k+1}, i_k)}^{\infty}$ for $k \geq 1$, and $\tilde{e}_i^{\max}\mathbf{a} := \tilde{e}_i^{\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{a})}\mathbf{a}$. Also, if we set $\mathbf{a}' := (\dots, 0, 0, a_N, \dots, a_1) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{\infty}$ for $(a_1, \dots, a_N) \in \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$, then we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{\mathbf{i}}((a_1, \dots, a_N)) &= \Phi_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}(\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{-1}(\mathbf{a}')) \\
&\quad \text{(by Remark 2.12)} \\
&= (\varepsilon_{i_1}(\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{-1}(\mathbf{a}')), \varepsilon_{i_2}(\tilde{e}_{i_1}^{\max}\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{-1}(\mathbf{a}')), \dots, \varepsilon_{i_N}(\tilde{e}_{i_{N-1}}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{e}_{i_1}^{\max}\Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{-1}(\mathbf{a}'))) \\
&\quad \text{(by the definition of } \Phi_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}) \\
&= (\varepsilon_{i_1}(\mathbf{a}'), \varepsilon_{i_2}(\tilde{e}_{i_1}^{\max}\mathbf{a}'), \dots, \varepsilon_{i_N}(\tilde{e}_{i_{N-1}}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{e}_{i_1}^{\max}\mathbf{a}')) \\
&\quad \text{(since } \Psi_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}} \text{ is a strict embedding of crystals)} \\
&= (\sigma^{(i_1)}(\mathbf{a}'), \sigma^{(i_2)}(\tilde{e}_{i_1}^{\max}\mathbf{a}'), \dots, \sigma^{(i_N)}(\tilde{e}_{i_{N-1}}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{e}_{i_1}^{\max}\mathbf{a}')) \\
&\quad \text{(by the definition of the crystal structure on } \mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{\infty}).
\end{aligned}$$

From these, it follows that the map $\eta_{\mathbf{i}} : \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty)) \to \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$ is naturally extended to a piecewise-linear map from the string cone $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}$ (see §§2.3 for the definition) to itself, which is also denoted by $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}$; we see from the equality $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}} \cap \mathbb{Z}^N = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$ that such an extension is unique. Since $*^2 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(\infty)}$, we see that $(\eta_{\mathbf{i}}|_{\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))})^2 = \mathrm{id}_{\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))}$, and hence that $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}^2 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}}$. Thus, we obtain the following.

Corollary 5.8. *Let $\mathbf{i}$ be a reduced word for w_0, and $\eta_{\mathbf{i}} : \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}} \to \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}$ a unique piecewise-linear map such that $b^* = \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}^{-1} \circ \eta_{\mathbf{i}} \circ \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(b)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.*

1. *The map $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}$ corresponds to the change of valuations from $v_{\mathbf{i}}$ to $\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}$:*
$$\eta_{\mathbf{i}}(-v_{\mathbf{i}}(G^{\mathrm{up}}(b))) = -\tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}(G^{\mathrm{up}}(b)) \text{ for all } b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty).$$
2. *The equality $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}^2 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{i}}}$ holds.*
3. *The map $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}$ induces a bijective piecewise-linear map from the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda, w_0)} = -\Delta(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda, v_{\mathbf{i}}, \tau_\lambda)$ onto the string polytope $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}^{(\lambda, w_0)} = -\Delta(G/B, \mathcal{L}_\lambda, \tilde{v}_{\mathbf{i}^{\mathrm{op}}}, \tau_\lambda)$ for each dominant integral weight λ.*

Example 5.9. If $G = SL_3(\mathbb{C})$ (of type A_2) and $\mathbf{i} = (1, 2, 1)$, a reduced word for w_0, then we deduce from [NZ, Theorem 3.1] that the polyhedral realization $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$ is identical to the semigroup

$$\{(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^3 \mid a_2 \geq a_3\}.$$

Recall that the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$ is regarded as a $\mathbb{C}$-subalgebra of the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[t_3, t_2, t_1]$ by using the birational morphism

$$\mathbb{C}^3 \to U^-, \ (t_3, t_2, t_1) \mapsto \exp(t_3F_1)\exp(t_2F_2)\exp(t_1F_1),$$

where we set

$$F_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \ F_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since we have

$$\exp(t_3F_1)\exp(t_2F_2)\exp(t_1F_1) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ t_1 + t_3 & 1 & 0 \\ t_2t_3 & t_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[U^-]$ is identical to the $\mathbb{C}$-subalgebra $\mathbb{C}[t_1 + t_3, t_2, t_2t_3]$ ($\subset \mathbb{C}[t_3, t_2, t_1]$); hence we see from the definition of $v_{\mathbf{i}}$ that

$$-v_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbb{C}[U^-] \setminus \{0\}) = \{(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^3 \mid a_2 \geq a_3\},$$

which is indeed identical to $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$. Now it follows from the definition of the crystal $\mathbb{Z}_{\tilde{\mathbf{i}}}^{\infty}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon_1(\mathbf{a}) = \max\{a_3, a_1 - a_2 + 2a_3\}, \ \tilde{e}_1^{\max}\mathbf{a} = (\min\{a_1, a_2 - a_3\}, a_2, 0), \\
&\varepsilon_2(\tilde{e}_1^{\max}\mathbf{a}) = a_2, \ \tilde{e}_2^{\max}\tilde{e}_1^{\max}\mathbf{a} = (\min\{a_1, a_2 - a_3\}, 0, 0), \text{ and} \\
&\varepsilon_1(\tilde{e}_2^{\max}\tilde{e}_1^{\max}\mathbf{a}) = \min\{a_1, a_2 - a_3\}
\end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\eta_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbf{a}) = (\max\{a_3, a_1 - a_2 + 2a_3\}, a_2, \min\{a_1, a_2 - a_3\}).$$

This piecewise-linear map induces a bijection from the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w_0)}$ onto the string polytope $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}_{\mathrm{op}}}^{(\lambda,w_0)} = \widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w_0)}$. Indeed, by using Corollary 5.3, we deduce that

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w_0)} = \{(a_1,a_2,a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 0 \le a_1 \le \lambda_1,\ 0 \le a_3 \le \lambda_2,\ a_3 \le a_2 \le a_1 + \lambda_2\},$$

where $\lambda_i := \langle \lambda, h_i \rangle$ for $i = 1, 2$. In particular, if $\lambda = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$, then we have

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\alpha_1+\alpha_2,w_0)} = \{(a_1,a_2,a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 0 \le a_1 \le 1,\ 0 \le a_3 \le 1,\ a_3 \le a_2 \le a_1 + 1\};$$

see the figure below.



Also, we deduce from [Lit, Section 1] or [BZ, Theorem 3.10] that

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w_0)} = \{(a_1,a_2,a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 0 \le a_3 \le \lambda_1,\ a_3 \le a_2 \le a_3 + \lambda_2,\ 0 \le a_1 \le a_2 - 2a_3 + \lambda_1\}.$$

In particular, if $\lambda = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$, then we have

$$\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\alpha_1+\alpha_2,w_0)} = \{(a_1,a_2,a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 0 \le a_3 \le 1,\ a_3 \le a_2 \le a_3 + 1,\ 0 \le a_1 \le a_2 - 2a_3 + 1\};$$

see the figure below.



Example 5.10. Let $G = Sp_4(\mathbb{C})$ (of type C_2), i.e., $\langle \alpha_2, h_1 \rangle = -2$ and $\langle \alpha_1, h_2 \rangle = -1$. For a reduced word $\mathbf{i} = (1,2,1,2)$ for w_0, we deduce from [NZ, Theorem 3.1] that the polyhedral realization $\Psi_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathcal{B}(\infty))$ is identical to the semigroup

$$\{(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}^4 \mid 2a_2 \ge a_3,\ a_3 \ge 2a_4\}.$$

Now, by the same argument as in Example 5.9, $\eta_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbf{a})$ is given by

$$(\max\{a_4, a_2 - a_3 + 2a_4\}, \max\{a_3, a_1 - 2a_2 + 2a_3, a_1 + 2a_4\}, \min\{a_2, a_3 - a_4\}, \min\{a_1, 2a_2 - a_3, a_3 - 2a_4\}).$$

This piecewise-linear map induces a bijection from the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w_0)}$ onto the string polytope $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}_{\mathrm{op}}}^{(\lambda,w_0)}$. Indeed, by using Corollary 5.3, we deduce that the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\lambda,w_0)}$ is identical to the set of $(a_1,\dots,a_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$0 \le a_1 \le \lambda_1,\ 0 \le a_2 \le a_1 + \lambda_2,\ 0 \le a_3 \le \min\{a_2 + \lambda_2, 2a_2\},\ 0 \le 2a_4 \le \min\{2\lambda_2, a_3\},$$

where $\lambda_i := \langle \lambda, h_i \rangle$ for $i = 1, 2$. In particular, if we define $\rho \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ by $\langle \rho, h_1 \rangle = \langle \rho, h_2 \rangle = 1$, then the polyhedral realization $\Delta_{\mathbf{i}}^{(\rho,w_0)}$ is given by the inequalities:

$$0 \le a_1 \le 1,\ 0 \le a_2 \le a_1 + 1,\ 0 \le a_3 \le \min\{a_2 + 1, 2a_2\},\ 0 \le 2a_4 \le \min\{2, a_3\}.$$

Also, we deduce from [Lit, Section 1] or [BZ, Theorem 3.10] that the string polytope $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}_{\mathrm{op}}}^{(\lambda,w_0)}$ is identical to the set of $(a_1,\dots,a_4) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$0 \le a_4 \le \lambda_1,\ a_4 \le a_3 \le a_4 + \lambda_2,\ a_3 \le a_2 \le 2a_3 - 2a_4 + \lambda_1,\ 0 \le a_1 \le a_2 - 2a_3 + a_4 + \lambda_2.$$

In particular, if $\lambda = \rho$, then the string polytope $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{i}_{\mathrm{op}}}^{(\rho,w_0)}$ is given by the inequalities:

$$0 \le a_4 \le 1,\ a_4 \le a_3 \le a_4 + 1,\ a_3 \le a_2 \le 2a_3 - 2a_4 + 1,\ 0 \le a_1 \le a_2 - 2a_3 + a_4 + 1.$$

References

[A] D. Anderson, Okounkov bodies and toric degenerations, Math. Ann. **356** (2013), 1183-1202.

[BZ] A. Berenstein and A. Zelevinsky, Tensor product multiplicities, canonical bases and totally positive varieties, Invent. Math. **143** (2001), 77-128.

[CLS] D. Cox, J. Little, and H. Schenck, Toric Varieties, Graduate Studies in Mathematics Vol. 124, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.

[F] N. Fujita, Newton-Okounkov bodies for Bott-Samelson varieties and string polytopes for generalized Demazure modules, preprint 2015, arXiv:1503.08916.

[FFL] E. Feigin, G. Fourier, and P. Littelmann, Favourable modules: Filtrations, polytopes, Newton-Okounkov bodies and flat degenerations, preprint 2013, arXiv:1306.1292.

[GLS] C. Geiss, B. Leclerc, and J. Schröer, Preprojective algebras and cluster algebras, in Trends in Representation Theory of Algebras and Related Topics, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich (2008), 253-283.

[HK] M. Harada and K. Kaveh, Integrable systems, toric degenerations, and Okounkov bodies, Invent. Math. **202** (2015), 927-985.

[HY] M. Harada and J. J. Yang, Newton-Okounkov bodies of Bott-Samelson varieties and Grossberg-Karshon twisted cubes, preprint 2015, arXiv:1504.00982.

[Hart] R. Hartshorne, Algebraic Geometry, Graduate Texts in Mathematics Vol. 52, Springer, New York, 1977.

[J1] J. C. Jantzen, Representations of Algebraic Groups, Academic Press, Orlando, 1987; 2nd ed., Math. Surveys Monographs Vol. 107, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.

[J2] J. C. Jantzen, Lectures on Quantum Groups, Graduate Studies in Mathematics Vol. 6, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996.

[Kas1] M. Kashiwara, Crystalizing the q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras, Comm. Math. Phys. **133** (1990), 249-260.

[Kas2] M. Kashiwara, On crystal bases of the q-analogue of universal enveloping algebras, Duke Math. J. **63** (1991), 465-516.

[Kas3] M. Kashiwara, Global crystal bases of quantum groups, Duke Math. J. **69** (1993), 455-485.

[Kas4] M. Kashiwara, The crystal base and Littelmann's refined Demazure character formula, Duke Math. J. **71** (1993), 839-858.

[Kav] K. Kaveh, Crystal bases and Newton-Okounkov bodies, Duke Math. J. **164** (2015), 2461-2506.

[Kir] V. Kiritchenko, Newton-Okounkov polytopes of flag varieties, preprint 2015, arXiv:1506.00362.

[KK1] K. Kaveh and A. G. Khovanskii, Convex bodies and algebraic equations on affine varieties, preprint 2008, arXiv:0804.4095; a short version with title *Algebraic equations and convex bodies* appeared in Perspectives in Analysis, Geometry, and Topology, Progr. Math. Vol. 296, Birkhäuser, 2012, 263-282.

[KK2] K. Kaveh and A. G. Khovanskii, Newton-Okounkov bodies, semigroups of integral points, graded algebras and intersection theory, Ann. of Math. **176** (2012), 925-978.

[LM] R. Lazarsfeld and M. Mustata, Convex bodies associated to linear series, Ann. Sci. de I'ENS **42** (2009), 783-835.

[Lus] G. Lusztig, Introduction to Quantum Groups, Progr. Math. Vol. 110, Birkhäuser, 1993.

[Lit] P. Littelmann, Cones, crystals, and patterns, Transform. Groups **3** (1998), 145-179.

[N1] T. Nakashima, Polyhedrai realizations of crystal bases for integrable highest weight modules, J. Algebra **219** (1999), 571-597.

[N2] T. Nakashima, Polytopes for crystallized Demazure modules and extremal vectors, Comm. Algebra, **30** (2002), 1349-1367.

[NZ] T. Nakashima and A. Zelevinsky, Polyhedral realizations of crystal bases for quantized Kac-Moody algebras, Adv. Math. **131** (1997), 253-278.

[O1] A. Okounkov, Brunn-Minkowski inequality for multiplicities, Invent. Math. **125** (1996), 405-411.

[O2] A. Okounkov, Why would multiplicities be log-concave?, in The Orbit Method in Geometry and Physics, Progr. Math. Vol. 213, Birkhäuser, 2003, 329-347.

[SS] D. Schmitz and H. Seppänen, Global Okounkov bodies for Bott-Samelson varieties, preprint 2014, arXiv:1409.1857.

(N. Fujita) Department of Mathematics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 2-12-1 Oh-okayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan

E-mail address: fujita.n.ac@m.titech.ac.jp

(S. Naito) Department of Mathematics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 2-12-1 Oh-okayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan

E-mail address: naito@math.titech.ac.jp